

HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME XXXVI

OCTOBER, 1943

NUMBER 4

PROBLEMS OF THE HISTORY OF GREEK RELIGION IN THE HELLENISTIC AND ROMAN AGE *

MARTIN P. NILSSON

LUND UNIVERSITY, SWEDEN

FACING as I do the great and difficult task of writing the second part of my History of Greek Religion, I should like beforehand to state some of the main problems and to bring out some dominant ideas. The subject is so vast that I can offer but a subjective selection; yet let me remark that my standpoint is not that of syncretism as a whole but that of Greek religion, which seems to me to be a factor of syncretism at times neglected.

It will be useful to begin with a very rapid survey of research, its methods, and main principles. Research in Greek and Roman religion and research in theology went on for a long time separately. The former was concerned chiefly with mythology and the separation became still more marked when so-called comparative mythology called special attention to origins. Christian theology looked at pagan religion as an inferior and vanquished religion. The saying of a father of the church, that Christians and pagans were occupied with the same crafts, went to the same market places and baths, was forgotten; it seemed to be forgotten too that Christianity grew and thrived amid pagan surroundings, and that this living together produced of necessity numerous and varied cross-influences.

At the end of the last century an increasing understanding of historical development pressed this truth home to certain theologians who were engaged in studying the influence of Greek

* This paper is a translation of a lecture delivered in Copenhagen in 1941 and in Uppsala and Lund in 1942. I have to thank Professor Nock for correcting my English style and reading the proofs, I myself, under the present circumstances, having been unable to see the proofs. M. P. N.

ideas and religion upon Christianity, e.g. Harnack and Hatch,¹ with regard to the mysteries Anrich,² and Wobbermin;³ while Lucius⁴ and Deissmann⁵ came a little later. Among students of Greek philology Usener was pre-eminent by his learning and his profound knowledge of patristic literature. In the seventies he edited martyr acts but he clung to older views and tried to find pagan gods under the cover of Christian saints.⁶ The decisive initiative was taken by his pupil Dieterich⁷ who began the study of the magic papyri, which include a strain of mysticism and which are so important for the history of religions in late antiquity. Thus was posed the problem of syncretism, that of the influence of Oriental and especially Egyptian religion and ideas upon Greek religion. This study was taken up with enthusiasm by Reitzenstein,⁸ the theologian Bousset,⁹ and by many others, above all the great scholar Cumont,¹⁰ whose early work on the cult of Mithra was most illuminating and who was the first to give a right understanding of Mithraism; he has devoted a long life to research in the realm of religious and astrological literature. Nor should Wendland's¹¹ excellent survey of Hellenistic-Roman culture be forgotten.

¹ E. Hatch, *The Influence of Greek Ideas upon the Christian Church*, 1888.

² G. Anrich, *Das antike Mysterienwesen in seinem Einfluss auf das Christentum*, 1894.

³ G. Wobbermin, *Religionsgeschichtliche Studien zur Frage der Beeinflussung des Urchristentums durch das antike Mysterienwesen*, 1896.

⁴ E. Lucius, *Die Anfänge des Heiligenkults in der christlichen Kirche*, 1904.

⁵ A. Deissmann, *Licht von Osten*, 1 ed., 1908.

⁶ H. Usener, *Legenden der heiligen Pelagia*, 1879; *Der heilige Tychon*, 1907; *Das Weihnachtsfest*, 2 ed., 1888, etc.

⁷ A. Dieterich, *Abraxas*, 1891; *Nekyia*, 1 ed., 1893; *Eine Mythrastliturgie*, 1 ed., 1903, etc.

⁸ R. Reitzenstein, *Zwei religionsgeschichtliche Fragen*, 1901; *Poimandres*, 1904; *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*, 1 ed., 1910; the three much enlarged, 1927; *Das iranische Erlösungsmysterium*, 1921; and (with H. H. Schaeder), *Studien zum antiken Synkretismus aus Iran und Griechenland*, 1926, etc.

⁹ W. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, 1913.

¹⁰ F. Cumont, *Textes et monuments relatifs aux mystères de Mithra*, 1896-99; *Les mystères de Mithra*, 1 ed., 1899; *Les religions orientales dans le paganisme romain*, 1 ed., 1906, the fourth enlarged, 1929; *Astrology and Religion Among the Greeks and Romans*, 1912; *After Life in Roman Paganism*, 1922; *La théologie solaire du paganisme romain*, 1909; and J. Bidez, *Les mages hellénisés*, 1938; *Recherches dans le symbolisme funéraire des Romains*, 1941, etc., etc.

¹¹ P. Wendland, *Die hellenistisch-römische Kultur in ihren Beziehungen zu Judentum und Christentum*, 2 ed., 1912.

These scholars pressed their views so zealously that for a time it seemed as if Greek and Roman religion would be obliterated in this emphasis on syncretism. Indeed the views of these scholars are somewhat similar to that advanced at the same time by a well-known student of the History of Art: Rome (and Greece) suffocated in the embrace of the Orient. True, these scholars have opened up a new field of research and they have added very valuable information to the history of ancient religions, but they are not free from onesidedness. Even when appreciation of syncretism was at its height, however, there were scholars like Geffcken¹² who directed their chief attention to Greek and Roman religion. This tendency has become stronger in the last few years. Wilamowitz¹³ and Kern¹⁴ wrote the history of Greek religion without concerning themselves much with Oriental religions; the prominent Catholic scholar Festugière¹⁵ holds a like position and the scholar of our days who knows syncretism best, Nock,¹⁶ writes: "In so far as the Oriental religions appealed to men who did not come from the lands of their origin, it was in forms which were fully hellenized in matters of fundamental thought and above all in their expectations of the hereafter. This is true in spite of the exotic appearance which they had and sometimes artificially adopted for purposes of effect." In fact he approximates to Schneider,¹⁷ the most consistent opponent of the current view. Schubart¹⁸ goes still farther and denies any influence of Oriental religions in early Hellenistic times. The great problem of research today is the just evaluation of the forces which operated among the Greeks themselves and Oriental influences; the

¹² J. Geffcken, *Der Ausgang des griechisch-römischen Heidentums*, 1920.

¹³ U. v. Wilamowitz, *Der Glaube der Hellenen*, 2 vols., 1931-32.

¹⁴ O. Kern, *Die Religion der Griechen*, 3 vols., 1926-38.

¹⁵ A. J. Festugière, *L'idéal religieux des Grecs et l'évangile*, 1932.

¹⁶ A. D. Nock, *Conversion*, 1933, p. 268; cf. p. 37: "For the subsequent expansion of cults from the Near East in Greece and in the West no worships are of great importance except those which were substantially translated into Greek and remade with Greek elements into cults which retained an Oriental flavour but were divorced from their original cultural and religious setting."

¹⁷ C. Schneider, "Die griechischen Grundlagen der hellenistischen Religionsgeschichte," *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, XXXVI, 1939, p. 300 ff.

¹⁸ W. Schubart, *Die religiöse Haltung des frühen Hellenismus*, *Die alte Orient*, 35:2, 1939.

blending of these forces and influences determined the development of ancient religions until the final outcome, the victory of Christianity.

One objection may be made to both these schools of research. They call attention to rites and magic, to ideas and doctrines without due regard to the social changes and stratifications of the population. There are exceptions, but the full complexity of the situation is not envisaged in its real extent; thus Geffcken rightly pointed to the fact that the poverty of the third century A.D. was a great obstacle to pagan cults and to the attitude of the emperors in religious matters, but he devoted little attention to social conditions. Similarly Kaerst¹⁹ speaks mainly of the influence of prominent persons of the Hellenistic age. In the last analysis the fate of religion depends on the broad masses of the people who in it try to satisfy such of their needs as transcend material needs and in the long run the victory is theirs, even if the educated governing classes resist. This social background is obscure and difficult to apprehend; to ignore it, however, would be to renounce any understanding of religious movements, of the conflict of the various religions and the final outcome.

It has been truly said that the decay of the ancient city-state, the Polis, also brought about the decay of its religion. The Polis had taken possession of the gods and had made them patrons of its existence and symbols of its political life; only so could the patriotism of the cities find an expression. When the city-states had to bow to stronger powers their gods too lost their might and their appeal. Nor can this be concealed by their continued existence due to the tenacity of old traditions, local patriotism and antiquarian tendencies and efforts. It would be still more correct to say that the religion of the city-state had to yield to a religion which conformed to the expansion of the world and the enlarged horizon of men. For the fossilization of the religion of the Polis is but the negative aspect of the religious development which began with Alexander's conquest of the world while the positive aspect is that new religious needs existed and had to be satisfied in forms adapted

¹⁹ J. Kaerst, *Geschichte des hellenistischen Zeitalters*, II, 1, 1909, p. 202 ff.

to the conditions of the time — a time when the Greeks were reigning over vast empires and were busy in many countries.

In this soil cosmopolitanism sprang up and grew. Philosophers taught that man is a cosmopolitan being, that his importance does not depend on birth, race or class. The emigration of the Greeks and their wanderings from one country to another is more important in this respect than the discourses of the philosophers. If, earlier, man was born to his gods, who were determined for him by his family and city, now he was severed from them and in distant countries they became pale, evanescent, more remote, less powerful. He made the acquaintance of new gods to whom, according to the old Greek custom, he paid due reverence, but these gods too were local gods of a town or country. Instinctively he needed a god who reigned everywhere and over all, a god of the Oecumene.

This god he tried to find in two different ways, starting from society or from the individual. The city state had been society to his forefathers, now its boundaries were overthrown and society was extended to the whole Oecumene. But there were no gods of the Oecumene, and so men tried at least to identify the gods of the various countries in which they settled, an old procedure which sprang from the belief that the name of a god could be translated like every word of a language. This theocracy is a well-known feature of the religion of late antiquity, oft recurring in various forms, but without far-reaching results. It involved tension and a conflict between elements of different origin, some of which according to circumstances outweighed others. Among the educated people Greek elements had the preponderance; upon the people who grew more and more assimilated to the Oriental surroundings in which they lived, Oriental elements exerted an ever-increasing influence as in the case of Egypt and Doura-Europos. In Syria Zeus is the most popular god, the local Baalim of course appearing in his guise.

Another method which could perhaps be called the logical outcome of a theocracy was to elevate one god to a Pantheos, a god of all. This was tried for Sarapis; the omnipotence of Isis was praised with high-sounding words, and even the old hairy

god of the shepherds, Pan, by reason of his name was entitled to this honor. Some gods, e.g. Isis, were called Pantheos, and there was even a god Pantheos. Pagan tolerance which allowed the gods to live peacefully together closed this road. The result at its best was but the pale theism of the end of antiquity.

Philosophy, especially Stoicism, had reached the same goal in another way. But its doctrine is a pantheism, even if its god is named Zeus and praised with warm religious feeling, e.g. in the hymnus of Cleanthes. Such a god and still more the transcendent god of Neo-Platonism is not concrete enough for the masses which did not understand him.

The world empire of Alexander the Great soon broke down; the political background of a religion of the Oecumene disappeared before the issue had been fairly raised, but the longing for a world religion was too deeply ingrained to be satisfied theoretically by philosophy and practically by race admixture and cosmopolitanism. On the contrary, it became ever more urgent. The empire of Alexander split up into a number of states, the Hellenistic monarchies. The framework of the Greek world of the gods is based on the framework of the state. As of old, the Greek pantheon followed the pattern of the great Mycenaean kingship.²⁰ The city-state did not depose the king of the gods, but his domination was weakened and in Greece the gods are independent of one another and of him. The political framework was changed again when Hellenistic monarchies came into existence. Just as the city-states had done, the monarchies necessarily used religion for their purposes. The Greek gods on one side and the native gods on the other were in fact only gods of the one or the other part of the peoples of the monarchies. Something that was common to both was needed, and this was found in the cult of the ruler who reigned over all. Various views have been advanced concerning the origin of ruler cult; here I wish only to point to the needs from which it sprang. Its weak point was that like the religion of the Polis it served a political purpose. It is certain that Euhemerism divested the gods of their dignity; the gods of ruler cult were human and people knew and felt instinctively the differ-

²⁰ Martin P. Nilsson, *Homer and Mycenae*, 1933, p. 266 ff.

ence between man and a real god. It is characteristic that people did not present votive offerings or prayers to the deified rulers.²¹

So this road was closed. The old religion had no god of the Oecumene but departmental deities who held sway over various parts of nature and human life. Its cosmology was mythical; the world was prior to the gods and it developed without their interference. Nature philosophy originated in the cosmology and for a long time applied mythical names to its principles. Consequently the old religion had no creator, no ruler of the world; philosophy introduced the demiurge. Zeus was the king of the gods before he became the ruler of the world, a dignity to which he was raised because he was the monarch of the gods. Many gods ruled over their special parts of nature; man recognized divine forces of nature, by an intuition present in all peoples and all ages. Being gods of nature the Greek gods had no inherent connection with morality and mythology had told many immoral stories about them, a point upon which criticism of this religion early seized. Meanwhile this character of the gods as gods of nature gave the *point de départ* for the origin of belief in gods. This took various shapes, a 'physical' one, an 'allegorical' one often connected with the physical, an etymological explanation, and finally Euhemerism; but all alike robbed the gods of their personality, reality and nearness to man, for they made them either impersonal forces of nature or mortal men. These views told against the great gods, but largely left alone the small gods who lived among the simple people of the countryside, untouched by modern ideas. It even seems that rustic cults had a renaissance in the second century A.D.²² The result was a breaking down of the higher elements of the old religion.

It is certain that an echo of philosophical discussions reached the masses. Traces of this are plain in the new comedy; then too there are the cynics and the diatribe and we know how

²¹ That the Greeks knew it themselves is proved by the words with which the Ephesians declined the proposal of Alexander the Great to dedicate the temple of Artemis: *ὡς οὐ πρόποι θεῶ θεοῖς ἀναθήματα κατασκευάζειν*, Strabo, xiv, p. 641.

²² Apuleius, Florida, I fr., 2; Fronto, Epistulae ad Verum, II, 6; Arnobius, Adv. nationes, I, 39, etc., etc.

people thronged to the speeches of the rhetoricians in the Roman age. Certainly the masses were influenced in some measure. But they heard other accents too, simple maxims speaking of God's greatness and providence, and moral sayings. The speeches of Maximus of Tyre with little change could be converted into Christian sermons. The great Christian preachers followed in their traces.

The 'physical' interpretation of the gods was adopted by Stoicism, adapted to its system, and the more Stoicism yielded to religion, the more was this interpretation used in order to afford an explanation of the universe of which there was a place for the gods and religious usages. The conception of nature changed earlier, even in Plato's time, so that God's hand was not seen in the common natural phenomena or in unexpected catastrophes, but in the course of the heavenly bodies which became visible gods.²³ Stoicism was not opposed to astrology but took a somewhat different course prescribed by its pantheism. In Stoics with religious feeling, men such as Cleanthes, the intellectual element of the universe was crystallized into a god with the name of Zeus who was at least half personal. This shows the development which was natural for Greek Nature religion, but the god of the Stoics had an essential weakness, he lacked personality and nearness to man.

Stoic physics were antiquated and astronomy, which was the most progressive and most exact science, was united with astrology which, because of its scientific guise, appealed more strongly to the people. For comparison we may adduce the influence of Darwinism on our conceptions of religion. A magnificent system of theology was created; its head was the god of Heaven, not the Greek, but the Oriental god of Heaven.²⁴ He was too abstract for the Greeks and was replaced by the Sun God, certainly not without the help of Stoicism. He had a natural connection with astrology. Neither became really popular till the introduction of the Julian calendar gave the people a handy instrument for astrological prognoses in daily

²³ Martin P. Nilsson, "The Origin of Belief Among the Greeks in the Divinity of the Heavenly Bodies," *Harvard Theological Review*, XXXIII, 1940, p. 1 ff.

²⁴ F. Cumont, *La théologie solaire*, etc.

life.²⁵ Astrology and the Sun God carried the day, and the Sun religion was even made the official religion of the Roman Empire.

Attempts to create a religion which conformed to the needs of the age should not be estimated too lightly. People felt the need of a god who included all things, ruled the universe and determined its fate — and though philosophy cared less for this — a god who upheld morality, punished wrong-doing, a god to whom man owed love, submission, obedience, and a moral life, in whom he could trust and upon whom he could rely. Nevertheless the god of Stoicism was the outcome of philosophical thinking, not of belief, even if knowledge became illumination (*γνώσις*). This development shows what was needed, for the Stoic god lacked personality, lacked precisely that from which man draws love and hope. Epictetus gives pathetic proof of this longing. Moreover this god appealed to educated people only; the common people needed something more concrete, more personal, more compelling. However, this god reached the people, at least the educated half, who were responsible for the gnostic doctrines and for a kind of mysticism which included demonology and magic.

We have to come back to the religion of the Polis once more in order to understand the situation of the individual in the new age. Its name implies that it was civic and political; the city was a sovereign political unity, but its roots are found in old rural cults of which the state took possession and which it developed for its own purposes as its power increased. These rural cults were *per se* independent of the state cult and survived it to the end of paganism and longer. The difference of the religious attitude before and after the consolidation of the Roman dominion in the Eastern Mediterranean is complete. In the Hellenistic age the cities of Greece were still free and followed their own political course according to the measure of their strength; the Greek cities of Asia Minor also were factors in the politics of the great rival powers, factors which could not be neglected; even if they had to adhere to the one or the other

²⁵ Martin P. Nilsson, "Sonnenkalender und Sonnenreligion," *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, XXX, 1933, p. 141 ff.

of these, the Hellenistic kings tried to win them over not only by force but also by generosity. The religion of the Polis as the expression of the free life of the city-state was still a living reality in the Hellenistic age, it was upheld by the educated and well-to-do classes, and its traditions were fostered in the schools.²⁶ Over against this we have to admit that it became more and more static and more and more a matter of business-like routine.²⁷

After the Greek cities had been subjected to the Roman Empire their situation was very different. In spite of the good administration of the early emperors and the philhellenism of some of them civic liberty was gone. Even if appearances were preserved, the cities knew and felt that they had to bow to the will of almighty Rome. The religion of the Polis lost its mother soil, independence; if the forms existed they were an empty shell. Even in regard to the leading classes of the cities religion was made a matter for the individual, the old social religion was ousted by an individual religion. Of course the routine went on with some renewals of energy and not without some reaffirmations. We see the change in cult associations.²⁸ The Hellenistic age was the flowering time of cult associations worshipping various gods; by the Hellenistic age I refer above all to the third and second centuries B.C., for the devastations of the last century B.C. had severe effects. There was a change in the Roman period. In it we see more associations of the craft guild type, as also associations of councillors, members of the gymnasium, of the *technitai*, of athletes, etc. Here we see the profound difference in religion between the Hellenistic and the Roman age. The decay of the old civic and social religion prepared the way for the spread of syncretism over the whole empire and finally for a religion which was common to all countries of the Roman Empire.

²⁶ I refer e.g. to the inscriptions of the Athenian *epheboi* and the *fasti* of the gymnasium in Cos, *Sylloge inscriptionum graecarum*, 3 ed., No. 1028.

²⁷ This is very conspicuous in the numerous sacral ordinances preserved in inscriptions of the Hellenistic age, e.g. concerning the mysteries of Andania and the oracle of Apollo at Corope, *Sylloge*, 735 and 1157 resp.

²⁸ F. Poland, *Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens*, 1909; see especially the lists p. 548 ff.

The once popular dictum that religion is a private concern is very false. It is wishful thinking rather than a reality. Every man who takes his religion seriously seeks contact with others of the same belief. Religion without a cult is practically impossible; the cult presupposes a congregation and brings about an organization. All religions of late antiquity strove at least in some measure to meet this need, but pagan religions achieved no more than an inchoate stage which could not replace the old civic and social religion. Christianity alone was able to build up a great organization conforming to the social tendencies of the age. This explains in some measure its victory. The cult of the emperors is an outcome of the same tendency, but it was sterile if not irreligious. The organization of the church was rooted in the free collaboration of the congregations.

In order to understand the change better we must consider briefly the difference between the old Greek cities and the new, big cosmopolitan cities of the Hellenistic world. The new religions of the Hellenistic and the Roman age had their origin among the urban population, especially that of the big cities. Their inhabitants were politically and socially very unlike those of the old Greek cities — I do not mean the upper classes which clung to old traditions and cults, but the broad masses of the lower classes. They took no part in political life, they knew nothing of patriotism, they were uprooted, emigrated to foreign countries or were born there, they mingled with the natives and with people from many countries, and mixed marriages were numerous. They had broken the bonds by which the family and the city-state held men together, they were thrown back on themselves. They were able to choose their companions as they liked among men as well as among gods. They turned in a direction in which they believed they would find refuge and consolation. Identity of ideas and interests, not family and state, determined their associations.

In this soil the new religions of the Hellenistic and Roman age originated and grew strong. The rural population was of little importance. In Greece the countryside was increasingly depopulated, the heart of Greek culture ceased to throb. In Asia Minor, Syria and Egypt the rural population lived on in

the old conditions. The cross-influences between the various elements operated in the big cities. Religion was urbanized, a fact of fundamental importance because of the character of the urban population, which was heterogeneous, mobile, given to vague intellectual interests, having lost touch with Nature and its phenomena. Christianity too was an urban religion, it succeeded late and with difficulty in winning the people of the countryside. The word "pagans" signifies originally "villagers."²⁹

The individual was uprooted and replanted in a soil in which it was very difficult for him to take new roots. The bonds by which family and state had held individuals together were broken. In his greater and lesser needs and sorrows, the individual sought divine help, protection, and consolation where he was able to find them. He had not yet lost belief in the interference of divine powers in the fate of man. The beginning of the Hellenistic age was a time in which extraordinary and resourceful men won power and empires, glory and wealth, but it was also a time of sudden changes of fortune. Those men of power and resource trusted in their luck and success. Just as in the heroic Mycenaean age, belief in Fate now superseded belief in the gods, but the belief of this age had another color than the Homeric Moira. Tyche, who may be called the theme song of the Hellenistic age, stresses the fortuitous character of fortune; even Automatia, that which comes by itself, was worshipped. The word "tyche" is ambiguous; it may signify bad luck also, corresponding to the vicissitudes of fortune, but Tyche as worshipped was the goddess of good luck. People took oaths by the Tyche of the king; Tyche is the patron goddess of the cities, even a local genius.

Most people, however, were not so powerful as those whose deeds history recounts, but had to be content with a more modest, often a very modest lot, especially after conditions to a certain extent had been stabilized, but they too were often assailed by the vicissitudes of fate. Educated people protected

²⁹ The first example of this significance of the word occurs in Codex Theodosianus, xvi, 2, 18 of 370 A.D. [For another view of its origin, cf. H. J. Rose, *Gnomon*, X, 1934, p. 55.]

themselves with the armor of philosophy and many lived consciously or unconsciously according to the Epicurean maxim, *λάθε βιώσας*. They did not discard the belief that the fates were in the hands of higher powers; the tenacity of this belief is best proved by the spread of astrology among the people from the beginning of our era. Tyche had too little personality for them, and the word laid emphasis more on the fortuitous vicissitudes of fate as the New Comedy shows. The people needed something more substantial, something that was nearer to man, and did not hang over him as a weary and a heavy weight. Here belief in the daemon, never wholly obliterated, found a place. The word signifies sometimes nothing but fate, yet it is the fate of an individual. So the idea arose that a man is accompanied by his daemon, a being similar to the Nordic fylgja, and sometimes it is said that a man has a good and an evil daemon. The daemon was, however, too colorless. Tyche became a cult goddess, the daemon never. Even votive offerings to Agathos Daemon, who is of another kind, are rare. The form of belief in Fate which appealed to the masses was belief in the false science of astrology.

The doctrine of daemons was developed in another and significant way. Seizing upon a casual saying of Plato his successor Xenocrates expounded the theory that daemons are intermediate beings between men and gods. So all those aspects of religion which were opposed to higher moral conceptions were attributed to the daemons, such as sinister rites, human sacrifices, and even animal sacrifices (by those who disapproved of them). Daemons were classified as good and evil and intermediate. This doctrine developed consistently and became very popular, for it made it possible to harmonize the polytheism of the old religion with the monotheism required by the higher religious standards of the age. The old gods were incorporated as the highest class of divine beings. Furthermore it made it possible to find an explanation of magic and sooth-saying. But in this way the gods lost still more of their dignity, for even if they were the highest class they were in the company of the daemons, among whom there were also evil ones. Christianity embraced and developed this idea with gusto, extending

on the one hand the evil character to all daemons including the old gods, and introducing on the other hand God's messengers, the angels, as mediators between man and god.³⁰ This attempt of paganism to harmonize its polytheism with monotheism deprived the gods still more of their importance and dignity without giving a real religious value to the highest god. For this purpose a god nearer man was needed, and Christianity gave the answer. It was protected against the taint of anthropomorphism adhering to pagan gods, in that its god, Christ, had lived on this earth as a man; God the Father was of importance to its theology, not to the cult or to daily religious life.

The doctrine of the daemons originated in philosophy but it laid hold of the masses too. The daemons became important among the people because of their connection with magic in which the gods too acquired a part. The doctrine of supernatural forces, the *δυνάμεις*, scarcely known to earlier Greece, became very popular and important,³¹ helped by the science of the age which made no distinction between physical and occult forces (*πνεῦμα, φῶς, χάρις*), the latter being the more important. The authors of the day and the numerous magical papyri with their strange recipes attest the vast and increasing diffusion of magic and magical ideas; they show how magic passed over into the sphere of higher religions. The Neoplatonists practiced theurgy. Sacrifice too was drawn into this circle of ideas. To be sure many pious pagans objected to animal sacrifice and it had become a mere empty form; but sacrifice occurred in magic and a magical or mystical sense was found therein, especially in incense which was very popular, for incense offering enticed the daemons to come and this was the belief in late antiquity not only of Christians but of pagans too. This fantastic belief in daemons and the practice of magic spread in ever widening circles, but it could not satisfy men's need of religious help. People wanted to be protected against daemons. Mysteries and magic promised protection but had no real help to give. Christianity gave it and its addition of exorcism to its ceremonies is noteworthy.

³⁰ E. Lucius, *Anfänge des Heiligenkultes*, p. 10 ff.

³¹ J. Röhr, *Der okkulte Kraftbegriff im Altertum*, *Philologus*, Suppl. xvii: 1, 1923.

In all religions there is a connection between the gods and morality, even if it is sometimes loose. Primitive peoples believe that the gods protect their laws and customs. So it was among the Greeks too, although the moral character of their gods was impaired by their being nature gods and by mythology about them. Criticism of Greek religion in this respect began very early. In the fourth century B.C. people spoke more often of "the divine" than of the gods and their invoking of divine justice was but a phrase. Philosophy took the place which religion had left empty, for it promised to teach man how to be happy, to lift him above the vicissitudes of fate, but to this end it required virtue, and a life according to its moral principles. Most people were unable to satisfy such high claims, but then philosophy knew how to bring consolation, it became a hospital for sick souls, it summoned them to repent and be converted, it had its saints and martyrs who led the way with good examples. Greek religion knows nothing of repentance, and conversion is absent from paganism, in which the gods, whatever their origin, live together peacefully. The idea of conversion originated in philosophy which in this respect prepared the way for Christianity.³² The similarity increased. Philosophy called out to man: Believe and promised deliverance, a deliverance, however, which man had to win for himself. But most people were weak and sick and much in need of help to enable them to do that which they were unable to achieve by their own strength, divine help in which they could trust. Not without reason was Christianity called a philosophy and the Christian sects, which fought one another just as did the schools of philosophers, were called by the same name as these, *αἰρέσεις*. Christianity took a momentous step when it transferred conversion from the realm of morality to that of religion.

This was a gradual development, but the history of religions ought not to forget that a certain intellectualism appeared among the inhabitants of great cities, even if it was satisfied by belief in authority and polemical arguments. Christianity gave more scope to this propensity than other religions. In

³² Nock, *Conversion*, p. 164 ff.

regard to morality we have presupposed its development and have to return to the question. Demands for moral standards were certainly intensified in the Hellenistic age, even if actual life was as bad or worse than formerly. The morality which philosophy preached concerned the upper classes, educated people. An adversary of Christianity is scandalized because such *banausoi* dare to give an opinion on such lofty matters.³³ The attitude of the Christians certainly came down from earlier times, for the appeal to morality, justice, and charity is the protection of the weak against the oppressions of the strong. The weak must advocate morality, even if they do not practice it strictly; for this they have certain excuses. There are sayings of the Hellenistic age such as this: Enter the temple with a pure mind after having wetted yourself with a drop of water; a little is enough for a good man, the whole ocean cannot purify a bad one.³⁴ The regulations of a cult association at Philadelphia³⁵ prescribe a morality as severe as the Christian ethic. Still more curious are the inscriptions from Asia Minor concerning confession and penitence in which a man recounts his sins, mentions the divine punishment, and expresses his contrition;³⁶ but such inscriptions are concerned mainly with small sins.

There was a sincere longing for a sterner morality the force of which must not be underestimated. For common plain men morality must be founded on an authority which commands not on philosophic grounds of reason. It must be stated in specific commands, for a morality stated in general maxims quickly collapses. A morality which imposes on man a yoke which he must carry has a very different compulsion. Oriental religions made use of this truth. This was the reason why the Jewish religion appealed to many; and the penances which Isis enjoined on her followers bound many to her cult. There was, however, no pagan religion save Mithraism which required a stricter general morality that was not merely of a ritual kind.

³³ Minucius Felix, Octavius, 5.

³⁴ Anthologia Palatina, xiv, 71; cf. inscriptions e.g. from the temple of Zeus Cynthius on Delos, Inscriptions de Délos No. 2529.

³⁵ O. Weinreich, Stiftung und Kultsatzungen eines Privatheiligtums in Philadelphia in Lydien, Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie, 1919, No. 16.

³⁶ R. Pettazoni, Harvard Theological Review, XXX (1937), p. 3.

Christianity knew of both, morality in small things as well as in great.

Consciousness of sin increased among the Greeks, perhaps under the influence of Oriental religions; it had, however, roots among the Greeks, in the doctrine of the wickedness of the body and of the soul's imprisonment in the body, which Plato took over from the Orphics and to which he gave content and meaning through his doctrine of the eternal world of ideas and the transitory world of material phenomena. In late antiquity this doctrine became fundamental in religion. Some scholars would trace it back to Iranian dualism, not realizing that Iranian dualism is a dualism of good and evil, not of spiritual and material, and is not opposed to this world or ascetic as is the dualism of the Orphics and late antiquity.

Plato took over another doctrine from the Orphics which was destined to exercise a momentous influence, that of the punishment of evil actions after death. The common opinion that this doctrine was not of great importance to the Greeks was false; on the contrary it seized man's imagination more and more. This doctrine was in definite relation to the demands of morality, including the increasing consciousness of sin. The mockery of classical writers should not obscure this fact. The fantastic descriptions of the Underworld in Plutarch and the grotesque picture of punishments in Lucian cannot conceal the fact that there was a background of very earnest belief among the people. That this belief originated in Greece, not in the Orient, is proved by the kinds of crimes and punishments in the earliest Christian source, the Apocalypse of Saint Peter.³⁷ Christianity made one momentous addition to the list of sins, namely the sin of unbelief. It rejected the doctrine of metempsychosis which looms large in philosophical expositions. Punishments were meted out not to purify and improve sinners, but as requital for evil doing. This was more intelligible to the people than the doctrine of metempsychosis and the improvement of evil doers. But the idea of purification came back in the Western Church at a much later time in the doctrine of purgatory.

³⁷ Dieterich, *Nekyia*; see note 7.

Cosmology and astrology evolved another concept, that of the soul's fate and its ascent through the heavens.³⁸ This too involves punishment and purification of the soul. So far it agreed with the doctrine mentioned above, but astrology rested on another idea which bound man in iron fetters, that of unavoidable fate, Heimarmene. In fact this is but a consistent expression of the idea of causation which was deeply rooted in the mind of man; it was inculcated by astrology which became very popular. Man was powerless in the face of its compelling necessity; it was a heavy burden which he tried to escape. Thus the doctrine arose that Heimarmene is valid in the sublunar world only, while in the higher world freedom reigns. Man could escape from the fetters of Heimarmene by being raised to a higher world, by being deified.

Thus man tried to free himself from the grip of Heimarmene, from his consciousness of sin, and from his fear of punishment in the hereafter. Those who took their religion seriously tried to find escape in mysteries or even in magic. Up to this point I have mentioned the Oriental religions in a cursory way, although many ascribe to them a preponderant influence in the religious development of the Hellenistic and Roman age. I do not underestimate their influence, but it was my purpose to show how the soil was prepared in which they were planted and grew, adapting themselves to a new environment. Reitzenstein himself says "muss jede Religion in der Propaganda und der Diaspora anders werden, unendlich persönlicher als innerhalb eines geschlossenen Volkstums, indem die Beteiligung an ihr selbstverständlich ist und dem einzelnen keine eigene Entscheidung auferlegt, und doch auch wieder universeller, für die ganze Menschheit, nicht für ein Volk bestimmt."³⁹

The Oriental gods could attract because they were fresh; the 'physical' interpretation of the gods by philosophy had passed them by; at all events they offered something new. A good example is the half Egyptian Sarapis. Foreign gods were often introduced into the cult of Greek cities and had then to conform to Greek customs and partially to Greek ideas too, but

³⁸ Cumont, *After Life*, etc., p. 91 ff.

³⁹ Reitzenstein, *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*, 3 ed., p. 17.

this is less important; the much debated mysteries are of the greatest importance.

So much attention has been paid to them and research has been so occupied with them, that a brief reference to them will be sufficient. All Oriental religions had mystery cults; that of the Syrian Goddess has recently been made known.⁴⁰ Of Mithras there are practically no traces in the Greek world, and the cult of the Great Mother too was more important in the Latin than in the Greek-speaking parts of the empire. The mysteries of Isis were the most popular in the latter. What was the Egyptian Isis before the Greeks took her over? The answer to this question is extremely important if we are to analyze the character of syncretism. It seems to me that the Greeks made two important contributions to the religion of Isis. First, they assimilated her to Demeter which emphasized the maternal aspect and made her the author of civilization, law, and even of mysteries. Secondly, they elevated her to a *pantheos* who was better fitted to a cosmopolitan world than to a national. At all events the mysteries of Isis are not of purely Egyptian origin. The Egyptian cult of Osiris did not include mysteries and the next life was to the Egyptians not dependent on an initiation, but on the performance of funeral rites.

How mysteries came into being in Oriental religions is an obscure and much disputed question.⁴¹ Scholars point to the fact that Oriental cults were conducted by priests who devoted themselves exclusively to the cult and its spread and to the fact that believers in foreign countries formed cult associations. This explanation is not sufficient; Oriental religions knew nothing of mysteries in the lands of their origin, and in the Greek and Roman world also they had a public cult and solemn processions. What was it then that made them mysteries reserved for the elect?

It seems to be practically forgotten that the Greeks had had mysteries since earliest times and that these were actively

⁴⁰ N. Valmin, *Inscriptions de la Messénie*, No. 2, *Bulletin de la Société des lettres de Lund*, 1928-29, p. 123 ff.

⁴¹ E. Briem, *Zur Frage nach dem Ursprung der hellenistischen Mysterien*, *Lunds universitets Arsskrift*, N. F. avd. 1, vol. 24, no. 5.

celebrated and elaborated in the Hellenistic age. From the beginnings of this age Greek mysteries had had sacred books and even the cult of the emperors cloaked itself in the garb of mysteries, as the title of the Sebastophantes shows. At an early date Greek mysteries were transferred to Egypt by Ptolemy I who, probably helped by Timotheus, a scion of the Eleusinian family of the Eumolpidae, established mysteries of Demeter in Alexandria; a suburb is called Eleusis and inscriptions mention a priest of Eumolpus.⁴² A decree of Ptolemy IV proves how widespread Dionysiac mysteries were in Egypt.⁴³ These mysteries which were very popular in the Roman age were much more Greek than Oriental in character.⁴⁴ The Homeric Hymnus to Demeter appears in a papyrus, worked over for an Orphic mystery cult.⁴⁵ It seems to me more plausible to find the origin and evolution of mysteries in the time-honored Greek mysteries whose forms were applied to foreign cults rather than to find it in associations of foreigners who worshipped their gods in an alien country.

Because Greek mysteries were transplanted to Egypt and spread there it may be reasonable to call attention to a doctrine which comes from Egypt and poses as a mystery, Hermetism, which probably originated in the second century B.C. It seeks the true worship in spirit and reason, the true wisdom in piety, considers true knowledge to be illumination, thinks that all things work together for the good of the elect, believes that vision transforms man, and that the elect are freed from the world order Heimarmene. Hermetism professes to be a doctrine of the Egyptian god Thoth, but little of it is Egyptian, there are connections with Greek philosophy, especially Platonism — also Stoicism — and with Gnostic, Jewish, and Christian ideas.⁴⁶

⁴² It is noteworthy that the priest of Eumolpos has the Persian name Bagoas, F. Preisigke, *Sammelbuch ägyptischer Urkunden*, Nos. 378 and 5065.

⁴³ *Amtlicher Bericht aus den Kön. Kunstsammlungen*, xxxviii, 1916–17, p. 191 ff.; Reitzenstein in *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, xix, 1916, p. 191 ff. [On this text, cf. S. Eitrem, *Symbolae Osloenses*, xvii, 1937, p. 33 ff.]

⁴⁴ Martin P. Nilsson, *En marge de la grande inscription bacchique du Metropolitan Museum*, *Studi e materiali di storia delle religioni*, x, 1934, p. 1 ff.

⁴⁵ *Berliner Klassikertexte*, v: 1, 1907, No. 2; O. Kern, *Fragmenta Orphicorum*, No. 49.

⁴⁶ Reitzenstein, Poinandres, favors the latter, J. Kroll, *Die Lehren des Hermes*

The much-disputed problem of Gnosticism⁴⁷ is still obscure, especially as regards pagan Gnosticism, and cannot be discussed here. The name shows that it aimed to be to a certain extent vaguely intellectual in character.

Hermetism cannot be called a mystery in the true sense of the word; perhaps it might be called a mystery of the word, not to be divulged to those who were uninitiated, but reserved for the elect. Philosophy adopted a similar attitude in its formation of schools and its contempt for outsiders. It is worth asking how far Hermetic ideas, transformed and adapted to certain gods and their myths and crystallized into rites, are related to the mysteries. This question includes the influence of Oriental ideas but Greek elements are also present.

Hermetism belongs to Egypt. Nowadays, however, the origin of the mystery religions is sought in the Orient. I am not concerned as to how the Isis mysteries fit this view, but want to make a remark of general bearing. People always say that the preservation of so much material, especially the papyri in Egypt, is due to favoring circumstances, and that the empire of the Seleucids had the like or an even greater importance for the formation of ideas in the Hellenistic and Roman age, but time has obliterated the evidence. Now, leading men born in the Orient, e.g. Zeno and Posidonius, belonged to the Hellenistic age, but in the Roman age the leaders come from Egypt, the greatest of Christian theologians Origen, the founder of neo-Platonism Ammonius Sakkas, its great architect Plotinus, the last great epic poet Nonnus, the last great Latin poet Claudian, the great leader of the Church Athanasius. The very numerous finds of literary papyri in remote villages prove how widely Greek literature was read even in the countryside. We do not know how it was in the empire of the Seleucids, except for the fact that libraries were of little importance there. It is doubtful whether the masses were any fonder of Greek literature than were the governing classes themselves. Favoring circumstances

Trismegistos, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters*, xii, 1914, the former view.

⁴⁷ W. Bousset, *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis*, 1907; E. de Faye, *Gnostique et gnosticism*, 1925, etc.

do not explain the statistics of the inscriptions. Those who know them know too how much more numerous and important they are in Egypt than in Syria and this explains the leading part Egypt took in the spiritual and religious development of the Roman age. I think it is fair to concede to Egypt a greater importance in the religious development of late antiquity than is generally done, for this country was the crucible in which Greek, Oriental, and native elements were mixed, melted, fused, and recast. Astrology is the specific contribution of Babylonia; but it was in Egypt that it was brought into the current system of Nechepso-Petosiris. Fresh light is thrown upon the importance of Egypt for astrology through the discovery of new astrological texts of Hermes Trismegistos,⁴⁸ to whom another system was ascribed. What has been proved for astrology may also be valid for the mysteries, gnosis, and other aspects of religion.

Reitzenstein finds decisive new ideas still farther afield in Iranian religion. In order to form a judgment on its influence which is a problem as important as it is difficult, a solid foundation has been laid by Bidez and Cumont in their work on the Hellenized magi.⁴⁹ The Iranian influence was great and early and Nock writes justly: "Nevertheless, what was written in the name of *Mages hellénisés* reached the general world of letters and thought to a far greater degree than did what was written in the name of *Égyptiens hellénisés*."⁵⁰ How far these writings reached the masses of the half-educated is another question of decisive importance for religious development, but, in this respect, Egypt had the greater advantage of the juxtaposition of different elements of the population coming from various peoples.

So far I have touched upon problems, without offering any solution. I come back to the much discussed importance of mysteries for the religious attitude developed in late antiquity and I fear that the view that mysteries were the decisive factor

⁴⁸ W. Gundel, *Neue astrologische Texte des Hermes Trismegistos*, *Abhandlungen der Akademie in München*, N. F., xii, 1936; cf. F. Cumont, *L'Egypte des astrologues*, 1937.

⁴⁹ J. Bidez et F. Cumont, *Les mages hellénisés*, 2 vols., 1938.

⁵⁰ *Journal of Roman Studies*, xxx, 1940, p. 191.

in these is somewhat exaggerated. The meaning of the word mysteries in ancient times ought to be cleared up; it is often very loosely used. Mysteries in the sense which we are wont to attribute to the word were reserved for the elect who were raised above the masses; their doctrines and rites were kept secret and it was forbidden to divulge them. We cannot postulate that the great mass of the people, even in large cities, was initiated into some mystery. The people turned to the common cults, private or public; and even if they used the terminology of mysteries they used it loosely and at second hand.

Christianity was called a mystery in this attenuated sense. It was thrown open to all who believed, even the ignorant, and may be said to have democratized the mysteries. It did so by reducing its doctrines to a few salient points in which the masses could believe, but which could yet also bear a subtle interpretation — theology as influenced by Greek philosophy attests this fact. Christianity taught one God who created and rules over all, but who at the same time is personal, transcendent, and yet near to man, it promised, through belief in God and through God's mercy, salvation which man could not achieve by his own strength; it promised continued bodily existence after death, which was dependent upon a belief in punishment in the after life expanded to the resurrection of the individual; it taught morality in the framework of brotherly love; and, finally, it had simple rites to which a deep inner meaning could be given.

To conclude I come back to the Hellenistic age in which the foundations were laid for subsequent development. I have tried to explain the great spiritual forces which brought about a new orientation in religion. The seed does not sprout and grow unless it is sown in a fertile soil. This preparation of the soil came because the centre of gravity was shifted from old Greece to Oriental countries and to Egypt and because social changes in a measure alienated the mass of the people from the old religion. In the Hellenistic age Greek religion rested on two supports, both of which were upheld by the upper classes, literature and concern for the cults of the city-states. The first of these was maintained throughout the Roman age and even

longer, but the broad masses did not care much for literature. The religion of the city-state too was kept up by the upper classes, but at the same time it was secularized owing to the attention given to its administrative order and to the part played by social ambition. The people at times took part in cults, festivals, and banquets, but they had no inherent devotion to the great official and literary gods. What they were capable of if a god satisfied their needs and seized their imagination is shown by the devotion given Asklepios, the healer of the sick. In old times they had eagerly worshipped the lesser gods and heroes; these cults did not cease to exist, but they were local and their importance was lessened owing to the devastations of Greece in the last century B.C. The heart of Greek culture ceased to throb. No important author was born in Greece proper save Plutarch. The Greeks could not take the lesser gods and heroes with them to those foreign countries to which the centre of gravity shifted. They were replaced by native non-Greek gods.

In these countries Greek religion was upheld by literary education and the public cults of the newly founded cities, and this again was chiefly the concern of the upper classes. All gods, Oriental gods included, were local and people felt the need of worshipping the gods of the country in which they lived, as the Greeks always had done. The great masses of the Greeks of whom there was a large number in these countries turned increasingly to the native gods, who often bore a Greek name. This increased progressively with the racial mixture of the Greeks and the native population. The Greeks and still more the half-breeds were cut off from their mother soil, in which the old traditions were rooted, nor had they made their own the traditions of the country in which they lived. They reshaped according to their ideas the religious material which they took over from non-Greek religions. They had a part in Greek education or more rightly half-education for as Tarn has remarked the spread of education produced multitudes of half-educated people. The magic papyri are a curious testimony to this fact.

These people and their religion were urbanized and removed

from their fundamentals and the natural springs of life and there was among them, especially in the great cities, a certain amount of vague intellectualism; they were spellbound by the beautiful speeches of the rhetors of which the sermons of the Christian fathers are but a continuation.

They seized upon scraps of philosophy and science, as the simple moral and religious maxims of the diatribe show, upon the doctrine of the *δυνάμεις* and of the relation of the microcosms to the macrocosms, the latter becoming popular after the Julian calendar had supplied the people with a handy manual for astrological prognoses in daily life. These people who had been uprooted and had not been able to take new roots became mere cosmopolites. Unconsciously they needed a cosmopolitan religion, a God near to man who cared for the needs and sorrows of the individual, but at the same time a God who proved his power and the sternness of his commands. This religious development was determined by the new and enlarged horizons — the mother country faded and life was lived in alien surroundings. This new atmosphere too was Greek but with an admixture of Egyptian and Oriental elements for although Greece was not suffocated in the embrace of the Orient it was fundamentally changed, not only by external influences but by internal development. This was mainly due to the fact that the old Greek religion became literary and official and was the responsibility of the upper classes while the lower classes created new religious ideas and forms, in keeping with their needs and the circumstances of their life.

LUKE AND THE SAMARITANS

MORTON S. ENSLIN

CROZER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

THERE are comparatively few matters of any real importance in the confused story of the Christian beginnings concerning which responsible critics would care to say, "It is established beyond peradventure of a doubt." Wilhelm Wrede, though dead, yet speaketh. And there is the wholesome apprehension that such a rash utterance may prove a boomerang: some disciple of the dead master who so hated those smug confidences is sure to step forward, indued with a double portion of his spirit, to challenge, if not to deflate, the incautious scholar.

Probably most students of the New Testament would nonetheless agree that it is not an overstatement that those who maintain that Luke-Acts is an essential unit — two scarcely to be dissevered halves of a common whole — have the better case. An occasional dissenting voice has been raised. Most, however, have felt that while such dissent has occasionally drawn attention to important matters which had been overlooked, these matters were, so to speak, by-products: the basic contention remained unshaken.

The consequences of this clear recognition of a highly probable fact of literary composition have been many and important. It is evident that when viewed or analyzed together matters which are easily disregarded in the examination of either half alone are strikingly clear. One of these is that to the author of this unfolding panorama one thing is central: the gentile mission was no new nor sudden step on the part of disciples who had found Jerusalem too hot to remain in; rather it was part and parcel of God's unfolding plan, and was to be discerned at every step of the way, had men only eyes to see.

The so-called Great Commission in Matthew may well be a magnificent conclusion to a superbly wrought book. Nevertheless it is separated from the gospel itself by a distinct gulf which must be bridged. To that author, however much he

might approve the gentile mission, — and that at the time he wrote the church was predominantly gentile appears to me very clear — it had marked a new beginning. During his lifetime Jesus had neither openly advocated nor seemed to approve it. On the contrary, his word to the Twelve was unqualified and unambiguous: “Go not into any way of the gentiles, and enter not into any city of the Samaritans; but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel.”¹ More than that, Jesus had scrupulously followed that proscription himself. Matthew’s rewriting of the ticklish Mark 7:24–30 + 31 is explicit.² According to Mark, Jesus went into the territory of Tyre (*εἰς τὰ ὄρια Τύρου*), and having actually gone into this gentile district entered a heathen house (*εἰσελθὼν εἰς οἰκίαν*). When he left the territory, he went through [*via* (?)] Sidon (*διὰ Σιδῶνος*).³ Not so in Matthew. As is his wont, he retains the Markan incident, but skillfully gives a totally different picture, in Mark’s own words. Jesus did not go *εἰς τὰ ὄρια Τύρου*; instead he went *εἰς τὰ μέρη Τύρου καὶ Σιδῶνος*. Far from his entering a house there, the woman actually came out of the territory to where Jesus was remaining (*ἀπὸ τῶν ὁρίων ἐκείνων ἐξελθοῦσα*).⁴ To be sure, Jesus meets the gentile woman, but not on heathen soil; and his attitude toward her, despite all the gratuitous labors of slightly scandalized Christian exegetes, is perfectly consistent with the apparent meaning of the word, “Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast your pearls before the swine.”⁵ Thus we are probably correct in assuming that by placing the Great Commission at the end of his gospel Matthew deliberately intended the contrast to be felt. Far from neglecting

¹ Matt. 10:5 f.

² Matt. 15:21–28 + 29.

³ Fortunately it is not necessary in this essay to struggle with Mark’s geography: *καὶ πάλιν ἐξελθὼν ἐκ τῶν ὁρίων Τύρου ἦλθεν διὰ Σιδῶνος εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν ὁρίων Δεκαπόλεως*.

⁴ It can scarcely be doubted that these substitutions in Matthew are deliberate, and that in his judgment Jesus did not transgress his own self-imposed rule. His inclusion of Sidon (*καὶ Σιδῶνος*) reflects Mark’s *διὰ Σιδῶνος*. By the addition *καὶ Σιδῶνος* Matthew compensates for its omission in 15:29, makes clear that *τὰ μέρη Τύρου καὶ Σιδῶνος* is quite distinct from *τὰ ὄρια Τύρου* and that Jesus did not “go through” any heathen city, and avoids Mark’s tangled geography.

⁵ Matt. 7:6.

the Jews — a not infrequent Jewish charge at the end of the first century — Jesus had devoted himself to them. It was not until he had perished at their hands that his followers had received their orders to about-face.

For Luke this is all very different. It is a far step surely from the handful of followers in Galilee or the little group in Jerusalem to the host of churches established in strategic centres throughout the Roman empire and with its doughty champion Paul at Caesar's court in Rome. None is more acutely aware than Luke of the magnitude of this growth; of what one might almost call the turns in the road. It was at the time of Stephen's death that a real change became apparent; it was at Antioch that preaching to the Greeks was inaugurated. Nonetheless, as Luke develops his theme, these are not essentially new departures. At Pentecost there had been a foretaste of it; not Jews alone but all the world, Jews and gentiles alike, had for the moment had the word preached to them.⁶ Nor was this a new, *post* resurrection about-face. Like Matthew, Luke has a great commission after the resurrection. Surely Acts 1:8 is essentially the counterpart of Matthew's more famous verses. "Jerusalem, Judaea, Samaria, and the uttermost parts of the earth" are the precise equivalent of Matthew's "all the nations," and in the order in which Luke plans to depict the broadening but steady expansion; the baptism of "all the nations" commanded in Matthew is certainly represented by Luke as being performed upon the representative Pentecost host;⁷ while the whole point of the Pentecost experience — the reception by the waiting disciples of the spirit which Jesus, now ascended to heaven, bestows upon them, even as Elijah had done upon Elisha — could hardly be improved upon as an interpretation of Matthew's parting word, "and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world."⁸ Unlike Matthew, Luke has so skillfully, if unobtrusively, led up to this

⁶ On the basis of both transcriptional and intrinsic probability the deletion of Ἰουδαῖοι in Acts 2:5 is warranted.

⁷ Acts 2:38-41.

⁸ This is but another of the many and different hints that are overlooked when the possibility of a genetic relation between Matthew and Luke is so confidently ruled out of court.

incident that were it not for the set of our minds toward the nature of Jesus' ministry, which we have received from the more familiar Matthew, we should probably never have thought of assuming that Luke had intended his readers to see any essential change of intention toward the gentile mission in this *post* resurrection moment. Instead he utilizes, as it appears to me, this Matthaean section, and quietly alters it to fit his own quite different view of Christian history.

This same note is insistently sounded at the beginning of the gospel. The initial event of the ministry is the rejection at Nazareth.⁹ In this section, framed from the materials of Mark 6:1-6, a quotation from Isaiah, and not impossibly an apparent confirmation from Matthew,¹⁰ Luke sounds this note which is to occur to the last page of Acts: Salvation has come to all men irrespective of birth, of race, of status. It had been in the world since the moment of the Messiah's birth and had been hymned by the heavenly host (2:14). Now it was being proclaimed openly and would continue through all time. Thus Jesus can refer to the experience of Elijah and Elisha — the one with the widow of Sarepta, the other with Naaman the Syrian. In his first appearance at Nazareth, in the attitude of the Samaritan traveler, in the gratitude of the Samaritan leper, in the assembled multitude at Pentecost, in the word of Peter to Cornelius, of James to his hearers in Jerusalem, of Paul before the Areopagus, in Paul's final word at Rome — "Be it known therefore unto you, that this salvation of God is sent unto the gentiles; they will also hear" — this note rings out unmistakably again and again. From the opening pages of the gospel to the closing pages of Acts there is thus a steady and orderly advance. It is all part of the eternal purpose of a God who knows the end from the beginning and of whom it cannot be said, "he repented himself and made a new beginning."

Is it surprising that of the three Synoptists it is Luke alone

⁹ Luke 4:16-30.

¹⁰ Those who are very sure that Luke could not have used Matthew may with profit ponder Luke 4:16a + 31a in the light of Matt. 4:13. Did this addition or "inference" of Matthew contribute to Luke's readiness to remove the later story from its Markan context to serve as his key passage?

who has any Samaritan incidents? As is well known, neither *Samaria* nor *Samaritan* occurs in Mark. In Matthew the only occurrence of either word is in the warning addressed to the Twelve: "Enter not into any city of the Samaritans."¹¹ In Luke, on the contrary, there are three incidents in which Samaritans are referred to, and in two of them with evident commendation.¹² All three occur in the long section, usually, but not very happily, denominated "The Peraean ministry";¹³ and all three are highly significant when once Luke's intent to show the gentile mission as a part of the divine plan from the earliest days is recognized.

The first of these three stands significantly at the very start of this long section which is commonly regarded as the chronicle of the fateful journey to Jerusalem. The words, καὶ ἀπέστειλεν ἀγγέλους πρὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ. καὶ πορευθέντες εἰσῆλθον εἰς πόλιν [var. κώμην]¹⁴ Σαμαρειτῶν, ὡς ἐτοιμάσαι αὐτῷ, have long caused difficulty to the commentators. Mark apparently has Jesus go south from Galilee via Perea to Jericho.¹⁵ With this Matthew concurs.¹⁶ Luke leaves Mark at 9:40 (= Luke 9:50), to rejoin him at 10:13 (= Luke 18:15) immediately before Jericho. If Luke 9:51-56 means that Jesus went south through Samaria, it would be a curious sort of itinerary which would include Jericho. Is this due simply to Luke's ignorance of Palestinian geography, leading him to assume that the way from the north to Jerusalem lay through Samaria,¹⁷ and without realizing that the obscure Jericho scarcely lay on that route?

This is possible, but to my mind hardly probable. It appears

¹¹ Matt. 10:5.

¹² Luke 9:51-56; 10:29-37; 17:11-19.

¹³ Luke 9:51-18:14.

¹⁴ Most modern editors prefer κώμην. Both readings are well attested. The possibility of scribal harmonization on the basis of Matt. 10:5 probably has been influential in leading to the printing κώμην. If, however, as is suggested below, the Matthaean verse is in Luke's mind as he wrote, πόλιν is to be preferred. In that case the variant is to be explained as due to harmonization with εἰς ἑτέραν κώμην (v. 56).

¹⁵ καὶ ἐκεῖθεν [i.e., from Capernaum: Mark 9:33] ἀναστὰς ἔρχεται εἰς τὰ ὄρια τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου (Mark 10:1).

¹⁶ Matt. 19:1.

¹⁷ Cf. Acts 15:3.

to me far more probable that this puzzling section in Luke is of his own composition and is intended as a deliberate and conscious answer to Matthew 10:5. Matthew had written *εἰς πόλιν Σαμαρειτῶν μὴ εἰσέλθῃτε*; Luke contradicts: *καὶ πορευθέντες εἰσέλθον εἰς πόλιν Σαμαρειτῶν*. If this be so, the reason for placing this incident at the head of this whole section is intelligible. This rejection in a gentile village is a conscious and deliberate parallel to the rejection at Nazareth which was arbitrarily placed at the head of the "Galilean ministry." This possibility is heightened by the obvious reflection of an Elijah story¹⁸ in both initial sections. Nor should it be overlooked that it is in this so-called "journey section," i.e., 9:51-18:14, that the story of the sending out of the Seventy and their return (10:1-16; 17-20) stands. It would not seem necessary to argue that this latter is an entirely artificial section, composed freely by Luke from Mark 6:6-13 + 30 and the Matthaean parallels. It is thus a deliberate counterfoil to the sending out of the Twelve in Galilee. As the twelve apostles had been sent out to the twelve tribes of the house of Israel, so the Seventy had gone out to the gentile nations, regularly represented as seventy in number.¹⁹

Thus I am inclined to feel it far from improbable that this whole "travel" section was intended by Luke as a parallel to the Galilean ministry, thus sounding the note that Jesus' ministry was to all men. It is not fully articulated, for Luke does not have the proper materials. He is not drawing here from a convenient already articulated source. Instead it is to all intents and purposes his scrap basket, composed of several independent stories which he wishes to preserve. On the other hand, the more I study it the less confident I am that that

¹⁸ The verbal agreement between II Kings 1:10-12 (IV Kings 1:10-12 [LXX]) and Luke 9:54 — cf. *κατέβη πῦρ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ κατέφαγεν αὐτὸν καὶ τοὺς πεντήκοντα αὐτοῦ* with *πῦρ καταβῆναι ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἀναλῶσαι αὐτούς* — is scarcely accidental, and early was noted; cf. the correct gloss *ὡς καὶ Ἡλίας ἐποίησεν*.

¹⁹ There can be little question that the seven "deacons" (Acts 6:3), who speedily become preachers, correspond to these seventy. In this connection it is perhaps not without interest to remember the 120 (10 × 12) brethren of Acts 1:15, and that according to the Mishna (Sanh. i, 6) 120 is the smallest group to be able to have a Sanhedrin and that the chiefs in the community are in the ratio of one to ten.

hypothesis accounts for all the stories. Several of them appear to have been of his own composition — some of them palpable doublets to stories which he utilizes elsewhere. Not infrequently interpreters of this gospel have detected a similarity between this so-called “Peraean” ministry and the Galilean; yet the significance of the initial rejection in the Samaritan village, of the sending out of the Seventy, and of the other two Samaritan incidents has not been sufficiently stressed. Jesus is not represented as preaching to Samaritans as he is in John 4. Luke’s method is very different. In John the lines of cleavage are drawn at the very beginning: friends, enemies, waverers are clear-cut. Not so in Luke. As in the latter part of the account (Acts) Paul is regularly represented — missionary to the gentiles though he may be — striving to win Jews until the last page of the narrative, so in the earlier section that same sustained note is held. Jesus is not represented as making a sharp about-face: first to the Jews, then to the gentiles. Christians in Luke’s day were still on the defensive against the Jewish charge: Jesus could not have been the Messiah; had he been, he must have had Jewish followers. Luke constantly seeks to meet this charge. Gentile Christianity did not arise through wanton neglect of the Jews. Far from it, Jesus had gone to them, and they had neglected him. Paul, too, had labored, but in vain. The outspoken word in the mouth of Stephen,

Ye stiffnecked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Spirit: as your fathers did, so do ye. Which of the prophets did not your fathers persecute? and they killed them that showed before of the coming of the Righteous One; of whom ye have now become betrayers and murderers; ye who received the law as it was ordained by angels, and kept it not,²⁰

is but one of many similar, if subtler, harpings on the same theme. But while this conviction is central in Luke’s thinking and while he gives expression to it at the very opening of his narrative, he does not make it obtrusive. It is always present, but, as it were, as an undertone. This message of a salvation destined for all is what brings Jesus to the cross; yet Luke does not venture to insert material at the time of the arrest to make

²⁰ Acts 7:51-53.

it conspicuous. Rather, even at the expense of seeming to fail to give a real reason for the arrest and condemnation, he is content to paint a picture of an increasing cleavage between Jesus and the nation. The Pharisees are represented as perplexed as to why Jesus pays them so little attention. And Jesus — the contrast with Matthew at this point is particularly noticeable — does not indulge in bitter criticism of them; rather his is an attitude of regretful sorrow that they are so blind, so deaf, that they will not see and rejoice that God's great gift which embraces all men embraces them, too.

Thus, reverting to the initial story of the rejection in the nameless Samaritan village, it appears to me of Luke's own composition. It is so definitely essential to his purpose; so closely fashioned after the earlier rejection in Nazareth, that it appears to me fruitless to posit it as found ready-made in some source. The dependence upon the earlier Elijah story already noted — and Luke finds in the Elijah-Elisha saga much useful material — suggests his own craftsmanship. Nor is it to be overlooked that the rôle of James and John, ready in their indignation to call down fire from heaven, is amazingly apt in view of the Markan words, *καὶ ἐπέθηκεν αὐτοῖς ὄνομα Βοανηργές, ὃ ἐστὶν υἱοὶ βροντῆς*,²¹ which Luke omits in his parallel. A careful study of the occasional Markan details which Luke seems deliberately to edit out of his parallel versions only subsequently to employ them in some later story — especially in Acts — as a significant, if not central, detail would probably result in a greater caution in postulating manifold and convenient sources from which he drew, and might well enhance Luke's reputation for ingenuity and able craftsmanship, though perhaps at the expense of his historical reliability. And finally, it may be worth pondering whether in his framing of this important, but fragile and artificial, little narrative he is not also influenced by the Markan story of the preparation made for the entry into Jerusalem.²²

The second Samaritan touch is found in the most famous of all the parables: The Good Samaritan. Despite its haunting

²¹ Mark 3:17.

²² Mark 11:1-10.

beauty it bristles with critical difficulties of a nature to make highly probable that both the parable and its quite unsatisfactory introduction bear evidence of Lucan adaptation.

That Luke 10:25-28, which serves as an introduction to the parable, is related to Mark 12:28-34 has long been recognized, though there is far from unanimity of opinion as to explanation. The non-Markan contacts between the Lucan version (which appears in this different context) and the Matthaean have led scholars, who scout the possibility of the easier explanation, to assume a highly complicated situation. The verses, we are told, occurred in both Mark and Q. Luke made use of the Q version; Matthew introduced a few Qish touches, although in the main following the Markan form and agreeing with Mark as to the circumstance under which it was spoken.

The assumption that the words stood in Q as well as in Mark appears to me quite superfluous. All the facts are adequately explained on the far simpler hypothesis that Luke himself utilized this Markan section as an introduction to the subsequent parable. When later in his narrative he reaches the corresponding Markan section, he skillfully utilizes the rest of the Markan material. Mark's three questions become two. But it is to be noted that the scribe's reply, *καλῶς, διδάσκαλε . . . εἶπες* (Mark 12:32), is used by Luke (20:39) as the pleased rejoinder of the *scribes* as they see how neatly Jesus has tripped the Sadducees; while Mark's final word to this series of three encounters, *καὶ οὐδεὶς οὐκέτι ἐτόλμα αὐτὸν ἐπερωτῆσαι* (Mark 12:34), is drawn forward to close Luke's shortened series: *οὐκέτι γὰρ ἐτόλμων ἐπερωτᾶν αὐτὸν οὐδέν* (20:40). Of the Matthaean-Lucan contacts²³ the most significant is that the scribe's purpose was to "tempt" Jesus. Certainly the form of the three statements — *ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτόν* (Mark); *ἐπηρώτησεν . . . πειράζων αὐτόν* (Matt.); *ἀνέστη ἐκπειράζων αὐτόν λέγων* (Luke) — suggests that this is the order of their development. Nor is it to be overlooked that

²³ Other Matthaean-Lucan contacts are (1) *νομικός*; (2) *διδάσκαλε* as a preface to the question (easily deduced by one — less probably by both independently — from Mark 12:32); (3) *ὁ δὲ ἔφη αὐτῷ* (Matt.), *ὁ δὲ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν* (Luke), as against *ἀπεκρίθη* (Mark); (4) *ἐν τῷ νόμῳ*; (5) the common omission of *ἄκουε Ἰσραὴλ . . . εἰς ἐστίν*; (6) *ἐν ὅλῃ* (Luke uses *ἐν* + dat. in three of his four clauses; Matt. has *ἐν* in all three of his; Mark employs *ἐξ* + gen. throughout).

from the tone of the two later gospels toward the scribes it is more likely that it is Matthew rather than Luke who first suggested the invidious nature of the scribe's attitude. Nor do I agree that an original element, preserved in Luke, has been altered in Mark-Matthew where Jesus himself is made to utter the admirable answer. Rather it would appear to me that it is Luke who has made that alteration for the purpose of having the lawyer convict himself. It is to be noted that it leads to Jesus' answer [εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ] ὁρθῶς ἀπεκρίθης· τοῦτο ποιεῖ, καὶ ζήσῃ. Not only is this phrase strikingly similar to ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁρθῶς ἔκρινας,²⁴ which stands in a passage showing similar traces of Lucan adaptation of a Markan narrative to form a not entirely felicitous introduction or setting, as will be indicated below, but also it can scarcely be regarded as uninfluenced by the other Markan narrative (10:17-31). In this latter section we have an almost perfect parallel to Luke 10:25-28. Someone asks Jesus a question. In Luke's parallel the question, τί ποιήσας ζῶναι αἰώνιον κληρονομήσω, is identical to the query of the lawyer. Then comes a quotation from the law. To be sure, here Jesus answers it, for Mark had so written, and there was not (as in Luke 10:26) any point to reverse the rôles. Then in conclusion comes in substance the same retort: πάντα ὅσα ἔχεις πώλησον καὶ διάδος πτωχοῖς, καὶ ἕξεις θησαυρὸν ἐν οὐρανοῖς, καὶ δεῦρο ἀκολουθεῖ μοι — that is, "Do this, and thou shalt live."

Thus it would appear to me far more probable that Luke has himself produced the setting 10:25-28 from material taken from Mark 12:28-34, colored slightly by Matthew 22:34-40, and cast in the form suggested by Mark 10:17-31 than that he found it ready to hand as a separate unit not yet incorporated by Mark into his triad of questions and answers. Were we able to emerge from the fog of multiple sources and from the especially obscuring mists of myriads of little sections produced by the marvelous ingenuity of those gifted early Christians as they throbbed *im Sitz des Lebens*, and allow the gifted Luke to be a real author instead of an adept with scissors and paste, we should probably feel this explanation a bit less complicated than the one now usually offered.

²⁴ Luke 7:43.

Not only is the dialogue between Jesus and the lawyer itself artificial, formed to introduce the subsequent parable, but, as has frequently been pointed out, there is a real, if subtle and inconspicuous, break between the introduction and what follows. The dialogue results in the query, Who is the man whom I am to love as myself? This the parable does not answer. Instead, as the other query, "Who showed himself neighbor?" reveals, in the parable the word *neighbor* is used in the sense of one who himself showed benevolence, that is, the *subject*, not the *object*, of the action. Nor is this to be seen as an objection to the hypothesis outlined above, as if, had Luke himself framed the introduction, it would have really introduced. Before that obvious objection is raised, it may be well to ponder just how these materials at Luke's disposal could have been recast or reworked to have made a neater join. Far more important it is to observe that this inconspicuous *non sequitur* — this introduction which does not really perfectly introduce — is not unique. In the same gospel, under almost identical circumstances we find the same curious flaw.

Luke omits the story by Mark concerning the Anointing at Bethany,²⁵ which seriously breaks the sequence, as Luke sees, between Mark 14:1-2 and 10-11. On the other hand, he does not, as is often asserted, omit it because he had already employed a similar story which he had found in "another source." Rather, he has himself already recast this Markan story to form a setting for another parable — the Two Debtors.²⁶ And here too we find precisely the same sort of inconspicuous *non sequitur*. As Luke retells the story, the point is obvious: The woman anointed Jesus because she loved him, and hence, because of this love, is forgiven. But in the parable the

²⁵ Mark 14: 3-9.

²⁶ Luke 7:36-50. In both cases the host is Simon. Luke makes him a Pharisee (instead of a leper) because of the nature of the context in which he plans to use this material (cf. 7:30 and the reference to "eating and drinking"). The omission of the leprosy is not surprising. Jesus healed lepers; he did not eat with them. The story of Lazarus the leper quite compensates for this omission. The woman is represented as a sinner because in the accompanying parable, which all this is to introduce, the debtors were "forgiven." And furthermore it is a most appropriate expansion of the theme intimated in the preceding section: The "people" and the publicans and "sinners" (cf. Luke 7:29, 34 f.) are wisdom's children. This next section (7:36-50) shows why that is the case.

point is inverted. The debtors love their master because he has forgiven them. But after all, had Simon provided water and oil, this would not have exhibited his love, great or small, but would have been his simple duty as a host. Thus it appears to me that we have essentially the same sort of situation, with a high probability that the slight "rough spot" is to be credited to the same author, who, skilled craftsman that he was, was limited by the materials available.

But in the parable itself is an indication that it, too, has seen development and adaptation. This was pointed out sixty years ago by the Jewish scholar, Joseph Halévy.²⁷ He argued that the references to the Samaritan are labored and unnatural. First, he is represented as going back and forth (in Jewish territory) between Jerusalem and Jericho, and as being on such good terms with the innkeeper that the latter is ready to trust him.²⁸ In the second place, priest — Levite — Samaritan is a suspicious triad, as unnatural — to quote Montefiore,²⁹ one of the few to accept Halévy's main conclusion — as would be "priest — deacon — Frenchman." "*Le prêtre et le lévite qui vivent des dons des pèlerins, et qui devraient donner l'exemple de la charité au commun du peuple, abandonnent sans pitié un pauvre pèlerin blessé sur une route déserte; un simple israélite, ne consultant que son cœur, prend soin de lui et le sauve d'une mort certaine*" (pp. 244 f.). Thus Halévy concludes that in the genuine parable of Jesus the original triad was priest — Levite — Israelite (the last in its technical sense "layman"). Early Christians, not understanding this use of "Israelite," and thus failing to see the contrast, viz., ecclesiastic vs. layman, made a real contrast — were not the priest and the Levite also "Israelites," i.e., Jews? — Jew vs. Samaritan.

It appears to me that in essence Halévy's criticism is just

²⁷ "Sens et origine de la parabole évangélique dite du bon Samaritain" in *Revue des Études Juives*, vol. IV, 1882, pp. 249-255.

²⁸ "Juifs et Samaritains ne mangeaient jamais ensemble et se refusaient mutuellement l'hospitalité. Dans ces conditions on ne conçoit guère comment un Samaritain pouvait se trouver en Judée sur la route de Jéricho, être en bons termes avec le maître d'hôtel, et surtout aller et venir à Jérusalem quand il lui plaisait" (pp. 253 f.).

²⁹ C. G. Montefiore, *The Synoptic Gospels*, vol. II, p. 467.

and merits more attention from Christian scholars than it seems to have received. I am inclined, however, to ascribe to Luke these touches — difficult, if not impossible, incongruities, as Halévy rightly insists, in the mouth of the historic Jesus, but an essential element in the divine plan for the development of Christianity as Luke looks back upon it and sees it foreshadowed in the ministry of Jesus himself.

Is it so surprising for *Luke* to represent a Samaritan going to and fro between Jerusalem and Jericho (apparently en route to Samaria!) when he has Jesus following essentially the same route as he goes via Samaria and Jericho from Galilee to Jerusalem? Again, what could be more natural than the contrast between the two heartless Jews and the sympathetic Samaritan, prophetic of the respective attitudes Jew and gentile were later to evidence toward the struggling church, and making apt Paul's final word, "Be it known therefore unto you, that this salvation of God is sent unto the gentiles: *they* will hear"? It is precisely for this same reason that a few pages farther on *in this same section* he retells a story which he has already made use of in the Galilean ministry, simply to throw into prominence a grateful Samaritan, and to ask the portentous question, "Where are the nine?"

It is possible that he has utilized an older story — perhaps an actual parable of Jesus, as most interpreters have maintained — to sound the note to him so important. This chief difficulty in this otherwise attractive hypothesis is that, if the original parable had a Jew, not a Samaritan, in the title rôle, it is hard to see in it more than "a tale with an anticlerical motive," as it has been recently aptly styled.³⁰ Thus I am inclined to hazard the more daring guess that the parable is of Luke's own composition and is constructed for this location. Sentimental reluctance to ascribe a favorite parable to anyone save the one who by tradition has come to be regarded as the supreme master of that art is natural, although scarcely more defensible than would be the insistence that all the salty and pointed stories attributed to Abraham Lincoln were actually uttered by him (or even by his contemporaries). It is time that

³⁰ B. T. D. Smith, *The Parables of the Synoptic Gospels*, p. 181.

it be candidly admitted that it does not savor of an irresponsible and reckless radicalism to recognize that our actual knowledge of Christianity's central figure is disappointing, and that the parables, far from being the best source of his *ipsissima verba*, are particularly so. Several — probably many — of them are almost certainly to be seen as the free product of a later age; none of them may with any confidence be regarded as free from later alteration. They may occasionally, indeed, reflect the kind of teaching Jesus uttered — though it is easy to overstress even this modest confidence — but they cannot be used by us with any degree of confidence as a source of knowledge of the truth he wished to stress.

Naturally it would be rash in the extreme to attempt to describe the reasons why Luke framed this parable precisely as he did, or even to try to trace the origin of each detail. There were more colors on Luke's palette than we can count. Nonetheless it may be suggested, without becoming unduly fanciful, that the story of Job and his sorry friends, who did little to rescue him from the plight into which he had fallen, may well have provided the basis for the story of the man who fell among the thieves, and was unaided by those from whom he was most entitled to expect sympathetic help. Not only does Job 16 provide a vivid original for the distress of the one who fell among unrighteous men, but in 6:14 ff. (LXX) there are striking resemblances:

Mercy (ἐλεος) has deserted me and the visitation of the Lord has disregarded me.³¹ My nearest relations have not regarded me; they have passed me by like a mountain torrent or like a wave (6:14 f.).

But ye also have come to me without pity, so that beholding my wound you are afraid (6:21).

The eye of him that sees me will not look upon me; thine eyes are upon me, and I am no more (7:8).

³¹ It is tempting to wonder if this phrase ἐπισκοπή δὲ κυρίου ὑπερέϊδέν με may not have suggested in Luke's mind the scene of the priest and the Levite (ministrants of the Lord) passing by without regard. A sorry mistranslation surely, but even in this day of annotated texts strange misquotations of the Bible are far from unknown, especially when the biblical knowledge is largely due to the memory of words heard read in church. It is not improbable that Luke's knowledge — like that of the majority of his fellow Christians — was acquired in this way.

Of course it is not contended that the one is in any sense a mere paraphrase of the other or that there are striking linguistic identities,³² but it does appear to me not incredible that the one suggested the other.

It is also to be observed that in the Markan passages from which Luke obtained his introduction occur the words *καὶ τὸ ἀγαπᾶν τὸν πλησίον ὡς ἑαυτὸν περισσώτερόν ἐστιν πάντων τῶν ὀλοκαυτωμάτων καὶ τῶν θυσιῶν* (Mark 12:33). Luke does not seemingly utilize these words. But, as suggested above, there are a large number of cases where the detail which Luke seemingly disregards as he rewrites a Markan section — and which omission critics ponderously explain — was apparently not disregarded at all but was carefully utilized in a different section. It is far from impossible that we have the same situation here, that is, that the reference to “mercy” being superior to “burnt offerings and sacrifices” suggested to Luke’s mind the contrast between the *ecclesiastics* who did not show *mercy* and the other who did. Nor is it to be overlooked that Matthew also fails to include these Markan words in his parallel. On the other hand, he twice adds to a Markan section the similar word from Hosea *ἔλεος θέλω καὶ οὐ θυσίαν* (Matthew 9:13; 12:7). Those who can consider with equanimity the possibility of Luke’s use of Matthew may be inclined to feel that the reason why Luke did not follow Matthew in this highly acceptable addition was that he planned to make this note one of the most emphatically stressed in his whole gospel.

And finally, if the possibility of Lucan authorship of the parable does not appear too utterly fantastic,³³ there can be

³² There is one linguistic point which has apparently escaped attention. In Luke 10:30 occurs the phrase *ὑπολαβὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν*. This idiom, common in Attic Greek, occurs only here in the New Testament, and, save for two occurrences in Daniel (3:9, 95), only in Job in the Old Testament. But in Job it occurs no less than twenty-five times, one of them being 6:1 (*ὑπολαβὼν δὲ Ἰῶβ λέγει*). It was the chance discovery of this curious coincidence now many years ago which first led me to consider a possible relationship.

³³ Touches characteristic of Luke, i.e., which are limited to Luke-Acts or which occur there conspicuously often, in this parable may be noted:

(1) *ἄνθρωπός τις* (v. 30), a common Lucan initial designation (cf. 12:16; 14:2, 16; 15:11; 16:19 and frequently).

(2) *πληγὰς ἐπιθέντες* (v. 30) — so also Acts 16:23 (cf. also Luke 12:48 and Acts 16:33).

little question as to why the particular road from Jerusalem to Jericho is made the scene of the story. The Markan passage upon which Luke has drawn so heavily occurs during Jesus' visit in the nation's capital, whither he had come over precisely this road. Was the fact that priests were wont to travel that road frequently to the neighborhood of Jericho where many of them had homes known to Luke, or was it by chance that the setting proved so apt?

The last of the three Samaritan incidents in Luke,³⁴ like the other two, is fragile and evidences the handiwork of the evangelist. There is no apparent attempt to articulate it to its context; rather the opening words simply serve the purpose of indicating once again that actually Jesus and his disciples are en route to Jerusalem. This verse (*καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ πορεύεσθαι εἰς Ἱεροσόλημ καὶ αὐτὸς διήρχετο διὰ μέσον Σαμαρίας καὶ Γαλιλαίας*) has caused difficulty from the earliest days. That *διὰ μέσον* is the original reading is scarcely open to doubt, though its meaning is far less certain than some recent commentators would suggest. Attempts to explain the use of the accusative case as either a reflection of the Homeric idiom or an anticipation of modern Greek are scarcely convincing. It is customary to understand it in the sense of "between," not that the phrase itself suggests that, but because of the interpreters' belief that Jesus went south through the Peraea, as Mark implies. Hence it would be shocking to think that Luke could have been in error

(3) *ὁμοίως* (vv. 32, 37), classed by Easton (in loc.) as "L." Its frequency in Mark, Matt., Luke is 2, 3 (4), 11; see below.

(4) *ἐπιβιβάσας* (v. 34), otherwise only in Luke 19:35 and Acts 23:24.

(5) *κτῆνος* (v. 34), only here and Acts 23:24. The common use of these latter two words in Luke 10:34 and Acts 23:24 is to be noted.

(6) *ἤγαγεν* (v. 34). A distinctly Lucan word, occurring in Luke-Acts forty times, in Matt. four, and Mark three.

(7) *ὁ ποιήσας τὸ ἔλεος μετ' αὐτοῦ*. With this "Hebraic" phrase cf. *ποιῆσαι ἔλεος μετὰ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν* (1:72) and *τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ εἰς κτλ.* (1:50, where apparently *ἐποίησεν* is to be understood). [Both of these latter examples are in biblical quotations.]

(8) *ποιεῖ ὁμοίως* (v. 37). With this is to be compared *ὁμοίως ποιῶ* (3:11 — in a unique, i.e., "Lucan" passage) and *ποιεῖτε αὐτοῖς ὁμοίως* (6:31; for *ποιεῖτε . . . ὁμοίως* Matt. reads *οὕτως . . . ποιεῖτε*).

³⁴ Luke 17:11-19.

on this point. As a reward for this pious *tour de force* one has a convenient geographical indication which "explains how Jews and Samaritans happened to be together."³⁵ The point, however, is not that Jews and Samaritans happened to be together, but that Jesus himself (cf. αὐτός) chanced to come in contact with the necessary Samaritan. It appears to me that what Luke is saying is that as Jesus was en route to Jerusalem via Samaria and Jericho he came into a village and found ten lepers.³⁶ Since the incident is so palpably an artificial one, deliberately framed by Luke from other stories, it is pointless to raise the question as to whether the village was Samaritan or Jewish or what a Samaritan and Jews — even though they were lepers — were doing together. One or two additional inconsistencies or loose ends in a story which bristles with them is a matter of little consequence.

Jesus is said to have told the lepers to go, show themselves to the priests. Obediently they start, and on the way are cleansed — at least that is the natural sense of the words, ἐν τῷ ὑπάγειν αὐτοὺς ἐκαθαρίσθησαν. Where are they to go? to Jerusalem? Is the Samaritan to go there too? How about the time element? Not only would the going take some time, but the ritual was a complicated one. Did Jesus wait in the environs for several weeks? Did the Samaritan go to the priests? Were the others engaged in obeying Jesus' command? If so, did their absence indicate ingratitude or obedience? Could not "glory to God" be given in one place as well as another? Why was Jesus so anxious in this particular case for the expression of thanks which he regularly is represented as shunning? When did the cure take place? Can ἰδὼν ὅτι ἰάθη mean that it was after the priest's verdict? How did his faith save (cure?)

³⁵ B. S. Easton, *The Gospel According to St. Luke*, ad loc.

³⁶ Although διέρχεσθαι + διά with the genitive occurs in Luke (cf. 11:24), he more commonly uses διέρχεσθαι in the transitive sense "traverse" with the object accusative, or absolutely, with no specific mention of the region traversed. It appears to me possible that it is used here in the latter sense, and that the verse is adequately rendered: "And it came to pass that on his journey to Jerusalem his route was via Samaria and Galilee." The seemingly ungrammaticic διὰ μέσον may well be simply one more example of adverbs or adverbial phrases coming to have essentially the force of prepositions, and as such regularly standing before a genitive.

him? Did his return before completing the requirement indicate faith? Were not the other nine saved (cured?)? Surely the words οὐχ οἱ δέκα ἐκαθαρίσθησαν; imply this. Is it implied that their failure to return brought back their leprosy?

These are not flippant nor captious questions. They are inescapable if the incident be considered an actual event in Jesus' life or even an independent story. But if it is recognized as an idealized account, heavily dependent upon an earlier story and retold for the specific purpose of stressing certain notes important to the author, the difficulties vanish.

That Luke 17:11-19 is a variant of Luke 5:12-16 (Mark 1:40-45) is generally recognized. But instead of the candid admission that it is Luke's own deliberate rewriting of the story he has already used with such alterations as suit his present purpose, the effort is made to explain it as occurring (with the desired alterations ready-made) in some special non-Markan source, such as L, from which he is supposed to have drawn so heavily. This assumption may free Luke from the responsibility of altering history — though it simply throws that responsibility back onto other shoulders — but at times, as here, it puts an undue strain on modern credulity.

The Markan story is repeated: a leper, the appeal for help, the cure and injunction to go to the priest for his inspection. At times the same Lucan alteration of Mark is repeated. Thus we have very similar opening sentences: καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ πορεύεσθαι . . . καὶ εἰσερχομένον αὐτοῦ εἷς τινα κώμην ἀπήντησαν δέκα λεπροὶ ἄνδρες (17:11 f.) and καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτὸν ἐν μιᾷ τῶν πόλεων καὶ ἰδοὺ ἀνὴρ πλήρης λέπρας (5:12).³⁷ In both cases the leper falls "upon his face."³⁸ In both versions the distinctly Lucan ἀνὴρ appears: ἀνὴρ πλήρης λέπρας and δέκα λεπροὶ ἄνδρες. In the sentence καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ὑπάγειν αὐτοὺς ἐκαθαρίσθησαν probably two distinct touches of the Markan story are pre-

³⁷ Easton, *op. cit.*, who regards the later story as coming from L, the former from Mark supplemented by Q, discovers Luke using in his opening words "an L phrase" which he repeated from 5:1 as he links back into Mark.

³⁸ πεσὼν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον (5:12), ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον (17:16). The later story, of course, requires that this be done by one grateful man; hence it is *after*, not *before*, the cure.

served in Luke's second version which are paraphrased in the first: (1) *ἐκαθαρίσθησαν*; (2) *ἐν τῷ ὑπάγειν*, a word used very sparingly by Luke and apparently to be seen here as reflecting Mark's *ὑπαγε*. It is unnecessary to list the several other distinct Lucan mannerisms or phrases which appear in 17:11-19 and which are recognized as Lucan by all critics. Thus one is safe in saying that after these several elements have been removed for what has been styled "an L section" there is seemingly very little left.

Nor is it hard to discover why Luke should have chosen this particular Markan section for repetition. The clue is found in the key story of his whole account — the Rejection at Nazareth (4:16-30). In this section the note had already been sounded: Elisha had cleansed but one leper, viz., Naaman, a Syrian. Not only does this account adequately for the later repetition; it is highly probable that the reason Luke inserts these words into Jesus' first speech is to lead up to the similar story which he is planning later to tell in the section he intends to frame, reflecting the (Markan) Galilean mission, and which is to serve as a veiled and discreetly inconspicuous memory in the mind of the reader when he comes to the latter part of the story — that is, the book of Acts — that God's purpose had not changed, but that from the first he had intended that salvation should be offered to all.

Not only does it appear to me undeniable that there is a very direct relationship between Luke 17:11-19 and 4:16-30 (esp. vv. 27 f.), but also that real contacts between the Lucan story of the Samaritan leper and the earlier story of Naaman exist ³⁹ which are scarcely to be dismissed as coincidental. Surely *πορευθεὶς λοῦσαι . . . καὶ ἐκαθαρίσθη* (IV Kings 5:10, 14) and *πορευθέντες ἐπιδείξατε . . . ἐκαθαρίσθησαν* (Luke 17:14) are worth attention. To be sure, Naaman did not have to show himself to the priest, while the Samaritan did. This, of course, is due simply to the fact that in the Markan story which Luke is following that element is involved. But the point to be noted is that the return of the Samaritan "to give glory to

³⁹ II Kings 5:1 ff. (IV Kings 5:1 ff. [LXX]).

God" does reflect the return of Naaman in gratitude to Elisha and his subsequent actions.⁴⁰ The blending of these two elements by Luke — simply because each of them was a feature in the two stories he is utilizing — involves the distinct infelicities already referred to above. The return of the Samaritan, though awkward — how could he have accomplished his mission? — is necessary as a climax to the story. It raises once more the question: To what extent is Luke's knowledge of things Palestinian (or even Jewish) exact? Did he know what the ritual involved, or did he assume that it was simply necessary to get a cursory endorsement from the priest nearest at hand as a routine matter? Furthermore, the general form of this Lucan story — many lepers of whom a Samaritan is alone singled out: "Thy faith hath saved thee," implying that the others had not received what the Samaritan had — suggests the motif, already employed in Luke's earlier comment on the Naaman story: "There were many lepers in Israel in the time of Elisha the prophet; and none of them was cleansed, but only Naaman the Syrian" (Luke 4:27). The obscure way in which the later story is told: Were the other nine cured or not? — certainly they did not receive the real "cure" — simply heightens the impression of artificiality which always results when various — originally unrelated — themes, each important in its own setting, are combined in a later *mélange*.

The impression that Luke did not find this convenient story ready-made in some assumed source (as L), but himself contrived it from bits taken from other stories, is heightened when one considers the word of the lepers to Jesus (*Ἰησοῦ ἐπιστάτα, ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς*) and Jesus' final word to the grateful Samaritan (*ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε*). There would seem to me little question that both are to be seen as coming from the Markan story of the healing of the blind Bartimaeus, which he utilizes a little later in his narrative.⁴¹ In both cases the petition *ἐλέησόν με* [or *ἡμᾶς*] is preceded by the vocative: in its latter setting, natu-

⁴⁰ Cf. *ὑπέστρεψεν . . . δοξάζων τὸν θεόν* (Luke 17:15) with *καὶ ἐπέστρεψεν . . . καὶ εἶπεν Ἰδοὺ ἔγνωκα ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν θεὸς ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῇ ὅτι ἄλλ' ἢ ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ* (IV Kings 5:15).

⁴¹ Luke 18:35-43; Mark 10:46-52; Matt. 20:29-34.

rally following Mark's word, Ἰησοῦ, υἱὲ Δαυεὶδ; in the earlier passage Ἰησοῦ, ἐπιστάτα.⁴² Furthermore, the fact that the phrase in precisely the same form, πᾶτερ Ἀβραάμ, ἐλέησόν με, occurs in the story of the rich man and Lazarus (Luke 16:24) suggests that it had caught Luke's fancy and that he had felt free to use it in other contexts (of his own devising).⁴³ Essentially the same situation is found in the other phrase ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε. This phrase occurs twice in Mark (5:34 and 10:52). Luke not only reproduces it in his two corresponding sections (8:48 and 18:42), and utilizes it here (17:19) as the obvious climax of the story, but even uses it in the story of the sinful woman in Simon's house (7:50), where, as has already been suggested, it is scarcely apposite: actually it was not her *faith* but her *love* which had "saved" her. One might almost say the phrase appears to have become for Luke a sort of stock-in-trade gnomic word of dismissal for Jesus.

Thus it would appear entirely unnecessary to look beyond Luke's own ingenuity for this story. The fact that he has chosen precisely this already used Markan story, has recast it from materials at hand so as to make this particular note clear, and has placed it in precisely this section which anticipates the gentile mission, is but one more indication of the all-important place which God's foreordained purpose to effect the salvation of all mankind occupied in the thinking of the unknown author of the Logoi to Theophilus.

⁴² The vocative, ἐπιστάτα, is employed by Luke six times as a term of address for Jesus. It does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament. It may confidently be called "Lucan."

⁴³ Essentially the same situation is found in Matthew. In addition to Matt. 20:30 f. [= Mark 10:47 f.] it occurs three times (9:27; 15:22; 17:15), in all three of which cases it is certainly to be pronounced editorial.

ON THE OPENING SENTENCE OF MELITO'S PASCHAL HOMILY

G. ZUNTZ

Ἡ μὲν γραφή της ἐβραϊκῆς ἐξόδου ἀνεγνώσται
καὶ τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ μυστηρίου διασεσάφηται
 πὼς τὸ πρόβατον θύεται
καὶ πὼς ὁ λαὸς σωζεται.

I. THE WORDING

THOSE present at the delivery of Melito's declamation can be supposed readily to have grasped the meaning of this artificial phrase; but for the modern reader, unacquainted with the accompanying circumstances, its studied preciousness becomes a source of bewilderment.¹ It may however be suggested that

(A) strong reasons speak against ἡ 'Εβραϊκὴ ἐξόδος denoting the 'Exodus' (departure) of the Israelites:

(1) Melito never refers to the Jews as 'Hebrews,' but always — twenty-five times — as 'Israel';

(2) The combination of *γραφὴ* with a genitive denoting the particular action related in a biblical passage is unparalleled;

(3) The combination of 'Εβραϊκός or a similar adjective with a *nomen actionis*, too, is in this style unparalleled.² 'The Exodus of Israel' is ἡ ἐξόδος τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ³ or ἡ ἐξόδος Ἰσραήλ⁴ or τῶν Ἰουδαίων;⁵ the genitive is in this

¹ Professor Bonner has discussed this sentence in H. T. R., 1938, 175 ff. and again in the introduction of his edition, p. 30 ff. He has stated the problems involved and presented the reader with valuable material and interesting hints for their solution. I offer the following suggestions with full appreciation of the painstaking and helpful work which is evident in every page of his edition (references to which are given in the following notes by Ed.). I would also here express my gratitude to P. Maas for repeatedly discussing with me the present subject and helping me both by his criticism and by his suggestions.

² Philo combines the adjective 'Εβραϊκός with *ἔθνος*, *στρατιὰ*, *γύμνασιον*; Clement, with *τρόπος*, *φιλοσοφία*, *βασιλεῖς*, etc. But a *nomen actionis* would be a different proposition.

³ LXX Exod. XIX, 1; Test. XII Patr. Jos. 20⁶⁰, Benj. 12³; Epiphanius, De mens. et pond., 3.

⁴ LXX, ps. 113¹.

⁵ Clem. Al. Strom. I, 21 (II, 84²⁴ Stählin).

combination never replaced by an adjective.⁶ Melito then could have written, without impairing the calculated balance of his opening clause,⁷ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ instead of Ἐβραϊκῆς — if he had intended the connotation which we contest.

(4) Materially this statement would be false: the scriptural passage read was not the story of the exodus from Egypt. In the whole homily there is not one reference to it.⁸ The lesson which occasioned Melito's sermon dealt with the institution of the Passover, and did not describe the exodus.⁹ A glance at the paraphrase, in p. 2, l. 30–p. 3, l. 1, of the text read shows that it comprised Exodus XII, 1–14, the same as given in Hippolytus' Paschal sermon (except for the strange addition in the latter of ch. XII, vv. 43–49): the typical story of the Lamb of God was its subject. It is only natural that these two instances of a primitive 'comes' concur with what is known of Jewish practice as well as of nearly all ancient Christian Passah lessons: Exod. XII, 1–20 belongs to the oldest stratum of Jewish usage;¹⁰ Exod. XII, 1–11 is common to the Byzantine,¹¹ Roman,¹² Mozarabic¹³ and Carolingian¹⁴ systems; Milano is said to read XII, 1–12 (not 11?);¹⁵ Jerusalem, according to the Armenian lectionary,¹⁶ read XII, 1–24, and Edessa XII, 1–29;¹⁷ all these break off before the narrative of the 'exodus.'¹⁸

(B) The concurrence of these linguistic and material observations appears to forbid the current interpretation of this clause. The Ἐβραϊκῇ Ἑξοδος here is not the 'departure of the Israelites,' as little as the Μωϋσέως Ἑξοδος in Origen c. Cels. VI 43 is the 'de-

⁶ Sophocles Trach. 51 τὴν Ἡράκλειον ἔξοδον might be quoted as a counterinstance. But this usage, peculiar to tragedy, has no bearing upon Christian rhetoric.

⁷ See Ed., p. 21.

⁸ Πῶς ὁ λαὸς σώζεται refers to the 'angel of death' who was averted from the Israelites (Exod. XII¹³).

⁹ Cf. p. 2, l. 23–25. — It is a possible, though not a necessary, inference from p. 3, l. 2–p. 7, l. 27, that the text read included also Ex. XII, 28–30, in a similar way as vv. 43–49 are added in Hippolytus. The main thesis would not be affected by this assumption. I incline however towards regarding the looser paraphrasis p. 3, l. 2–6 as Melito's addition to the text actually read. It serves as a basis for the long ekphrasis of (a) the sufferings of the Egyptians (p. 3, 15–p. 5, 20) and (b) the protection of Israel by the τῦπος of the suffering Christ (5, 20–7, 27) which opens with the elaborate period p. 3, 6–14.

¹⁰ Cf. A. Büchler, Jew. Quart. Rev., V, 1893, 443 f., 449, 453; I. Elbogen, Der Jüdische Gottesdienst, 1913, 158 and 163; H. St. J. Thackeray, The Septuagint and Jewish Worship, 1921, 127; G. F. Moore, Judaism, I, 1927, 298.

¹¹ Prophetologio n, L. 41d.

¹² Dom G. Morin, Le plus ancien comes de l'église Romaine, Rev. Bened., 1910, 54.

¹³ Missale Mixtum Mozarabicum (Migne 85, p. 451).

¹⁴ E. Ranke, Das kirchliche Perikopensystem, 1847, 344.

¹⁵ Cabrol, Dict. Arch. Chrét., V, 293, nr. 70.

¹⁶ F. C. Conybeare, Rituale Armenorum, 1905, 522.

¹⁷ F. C. Burkitt in Proceedings of the British Academy, 1923, p. 825.

¹⁸ There are two exceptions in the far West: the Liber Comicus Toletanus (indicating vv. 1–42) and the Luxeuil-lectionary (vv. 1–50).

parture of Moses.' It can, then, only be the book-title. In this interpretation the difficulties of the alternative one disappear. The lesson read was, of course, from the Book of Exodus. With the combination ἡ γραφή τῆς 'Εξόδου we may compare

Test. XII Patr., Zeb. 34 ἐν γραφῇ Νόμου Μωυσέως γέγραπται (a quotation follows),

Origen, Comm. ad Joh. 1¹ (p. 485⁵ Preuschen) κατὰ τὴν τῶν Παροιμιῶν γραφὴν (a quotation follows),

Origen ib. XII¹ (p. 425¹²) τῆς ὅλου τοῦ κατὰ τὸν Ἰωάννην εὐαγγελίου γραφῆς,

Athan. Epist. Encycl. 1 (P.G. XXV, 224 A) ὡς ἡ θεία τῶν Κριτῶν διαγορεύει γραφή (quotation),

Marcellus Ancyr. apud Euseb., Contra Marcellum II, 3 (P.G. XXIV, 804 C) Τοῦτο δὴ ἡμῖν τὸ μυστήριον παρίστησιν ἡ τῆς 'Εξόδου γραφή, τοὺς τῶν ἀποστόλων τύπους πάλαι προαγορεύουσα· δώδεκα γὰρ ὄντων τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν ἀποστόλων δώδεκα πηγῶν μέμνηται.¹⁹

Melito uses the word γραφή with the connotation, normal in Early Christian texts,²⁰ of 'Scriptural passage.' Thus the whole expression is substantially like the regular headings of lessons in the Byzantine Septuagint lectionary, the Prophetologion. There, a lesson from (e.g.) Exodus is regularly introduced as Ἀνάγνωσμα τῆς 'Εξόδου, or Τῆς 'Εξόδου τὸ ἀνάγνωσμα, or just Τῆς 'Εξόδου.

For the combination of the adjective Ἑβραϊκός with the book-title I can offer only one real parallel:

Eusebius in Psalm. praef. (P.G. XXIII, 73 B) ἐν τῇ Ἑβραϊκῇ Βίβλῳ τῶν Ψαλμῶν (Βίβλος τῶν Ψαλμῶν is the book-title, cf. ib., 73 D, 76 A);

besides, reference may be made to τὸ Συριακόν scil. εὐαγγέλιον Eus. Hist. Eccl. IV, 22⁸ and to τὸ Ἑβραϊκόν or τὸ Ἰουδαϊκόν (scil. εὐαγγέλιον) denoting the Gospel according to the Hebrews (cf. 'in Hebraico evangelio' Jerome).²¹

The scarcity of close analogies with the expression ἡ Ἑβραϊκὴ Ἑξοδος may be ascribed to the uniqueness, in the extant litera-

¹⁹ Cf. also Philo, Migr. Abr. 34 (II, 275⁵) τὴν . . . τῶν κατὰ φιλοσοφίαν δογμάτων γραφῶν and Origen, Joh. XI, 4 (p. 185⁶) ἐν τῇ προκειμένῃ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου γραφῇ.

²⁰ In the New Testament and in the Apostolic Fathers γραφή in the singular as a rule means 'Scriptural passage'; see (e.g.) Acts 8³² and 36 with K. Lake's note, Mk. 12¹⁰, Luke 4², John 7⁴², 13¹⁸ etc.; II Clem. Cor. 24; cf. Lightfoot, Galatians 7th ed., 147. For later instances cf. Eusebius, in psalm. LXVII, 23 (P.G. XXIII, 706 D) ἡ παρούσα γραφή (cf. ib., 761 C) and the preceding note.

²¹ See the passages collected by E. Preuschen, Antilegomena², 1905, p. 5 ff.

ture, of the situation to which Melito refers.²² That he should have described it with such detail was probably due to his desire to produce a full and well balanced exordium. But he would not qualify the sacred notion of *γραφή* by a profane adjective and therefore avoided the more normal expression ἡ Ἑβραϊκὴ *γραφή*; while the straightforward adverb *ἐβραϊστί* may have appeared too plain and matter of fact to fit his elevated style. Thus the combination ἡ Ἑβραϊκὴ Ἑξοδος was the only choice (cf. 5¹⁴ τῇ Αἰγυπτιακῇ *φωνῇ*); though uncommon, it is in itself unobjectionable.

(C) The balance of probability then appears to favor the interpretation 'the lesson from Exodus has been read in Hebrew.' Thus understood this phrase suggests a satisfactory meaning also of the controversial second clause: some elucidation was indeed called for to make the words read in Hebrew understandable. Thus, and thus only, the much discussed word *διασεδάφηται* gains a suitable meaning. For it is certainly true that in Koine Greek the verb *διασαφέω* can be used, like English 'declare,' with little or no intimation of its radical connotation. But in the present context it is impossible to acknowledge a 'parallelismus membrorum,' with the second colon merely echoing the content of the first. The passages quoted by Professor Bonner, to which others can be added,²³ leave no doubt that, with the object *ρήματα*, this verb can only refer to 'eluci-

²² Where else was there, in Greek literature, an opportunity to quote a book-title with an adjective qualifying the language? I can only think of the critical work on the Old Testament by Origen and his successors. They, however, nearly always compare single passages with the corresponding Hebrew. This gives no occasion to indicate the book-title: τὸ Ἑβραϊκόν, ἡ Ἑβραϊκὴ *γραφή* or *ἀνάγνωσις*, *ἐβραϊστί* are the natural forms of reference. Rarely a passage from another book is adduced, hardly ever with the addition of the Ἑβραϊκὴ *ἀκρίβεια*. In the two cases of this kind which I have been able to trace (Maximus Confessor, Schol. in Dionys. Areop. De Myst. Theol. I (P. G. IV, 421 B) and Eusebius, De Eccl. Theol. III, 2 (P. G. XXIV, 977 D)) the Hebrew is in the usual way superadded to the Greek: there was then no reason to repeat the book-title.

²³ H.T.R., XXXI, 176, n. 2; Ed., p. 31. — Suidas *διασαφῆσαι* ἐρμηνεύσαι, cf. Hesychius s.v.; Acta Petr. et Andr., XV, p. 124 Bonnet (*διασάφησις* equalling *ἐρμηνεία*); Cyril of Alexandria, De Ador., I, 3 (P. G. LXVIII, 137 B): *διασάφησις* of the hidden typological sense of the Law; Isidore of Pelusium, Epist. I, 73 (P. G. LXXVIII, 233 A): *διασάφησις* of a problem of theodicy. — I am indebted to the Librarian of Pusey House for allowing me to use the manuscript of the Dict. Patr. Greek, from which I have borrowed several instances quoted in this article.

dation,' 'interpretation' i.e., as Professor Bonner stresses,²⁴ something materially different from the first clause.

As long as Melito's lector was supposed to have read the lesson in Greek, this interpretation led into a blind alley: what kind of *διασάφησις* could possibly have been inserted between the lesson and the homily? It is indeed well known that in the primitive Church the *ἀναγνώστης* was supposed to be *διηγητικός* i.e. to be able to add an interpretation of the passage he had read. Of this usage II Clement affords an instance. But in the present case the preacher has taken over the *διήγησις*: p. 2^{25ff.} contains this *interpretatio ad verbum* preceding the *interpretatio ad sensum*; the former is twice expressly called *διήγησις*.²⁵ No Greek or Latin grammarian²⁶ or Father ever had an assistant relieving him from the task of word-exegesis; Melito gives it himself, as Aristarchus or Dionysius Thrax had done before him, and as Origen or Chrysostom were to do later on.

Professor Youtie has drawn attention to the highly relevant use of *διασάφησις* in Aristeas 305.²⁷ The assertion that at this place it means 'translation' is indeed attractive. All comparable passages, however, attest the meaning 'elucidation' only. And yet he is right. The fact is, both Aristeas and Melito are using this Greek word with the special connotation which it had been given by Greek speaking Jews. It is the equivalent of an Aramaic synonym for 'targum.'

This assertion, I am afraid, is based on some rather technical reasoning. It may be argued, first, that the notion of 'translating' does not exist in Greek speech — just as there are no translations in Greek literature. To the Greek, a person either speaks 'clearly' (*σαφῶς*), i.e. *ἐλληνίζει*, or *βαρβαρίζει*, i.e. he utters indistinct sounds which need 'clearing up': the business of an

²⁴ Ed., p. 36.

²⁵ Ed., p. 32 with note 2 and ib. 33; H.T.R., XXXI, 177; Melito 2²⁵, 7²⁷. The same applies to Hippolytus' Paschal homily.

²⁶ H.T.R., XXXI, 178-182; Ed., p. 32 f.; cf. C. Höeg, *La Notation Ecphonétique*, 1935, 152. As to the passage quoted from Origen on Numbers, I cannot but subscribe to Prof. Ch. Martin's interpretation: the dozens of parallel passages in Origen (suitably collected in Cabrol's *Mon. Lit.*) would seem to put it beyond doubt that 'explicuit' is a merely stylistic variation of the regular reference to the reader's preceding recitation.

²⁷ Ed., p. 35 f.

(2) Targum Onkelos Deut. 1₅ has פְּרִישׁ where the LXX has διασαφῆσαι; ib. 27₈ the same form corresponds with Greek σαφῶς;

(3) The text of Ezra has three times (4₁₁, 5₆, 7₁₁) the word פְּרִשָּׁן, of uncertain origin (Persian?) and connotation.³² In the Latin Vulgate it is rendered 'exemplar.' This notion is adopted in most of the modern translations and is found also twice in the 'Lucianic' group of LXX-MSS.³³ But the older translations connected the strange word with the root פִּרֵשׁ. Διαταγή Esdr. B' 4₁₁ may be due to an effort at reproducing the etymological notion of פִּרֵשׁ 'separate' (*distinguo διατάττω*). Ib. 5₆ and 7₁₁ however the old MSS. render פְּרִשָּׁן by διασάφησις. In accordance with this rendering Rashi (based on earlier exegesis) at all three places gives 'explanation,' 'elucidation.' The sense intended can only be 'elucidation in our language,' i.e. — in modern speech — 'translation.'³⁴

The equation, then, of פִּרֵשׁ and διασαφῶ in the speech of Jewish Hellenists would seem to be a fact. Now it has been shown how the Aramaic root was instrumental in tracing to the 'second Moses' the institution of the Aramaic targum. The corresponding Greek word is used in Aristeas with reference to the production of the canonical Greek targum:³⁵ the Septuagint. Nowhere else is the Greek word found with this special connotation — except in Melito. He, too, uses it to denote the 'elucidation' of Hebrew Scripture. The agreement of these two in this singular usage indicates the common source: the theological terminology of Hellenistic Jewry. Given a slight amount of special emphasis Melito's second colon might be rendered: 'the relevant section of the targum has been heard.' And quite apart from material considerations the use of the term διασαφῶ makes overwhelmingly probable that this targum was the Septuagint.

³² Happily I need not here inquire into the real problems of this word and of its relation to פְּרִשָּׁן in Esther: in the present context only its interpretation by Hellenistic rabbis needs to be considered.

³³ Esdr. B' 5₆ ἀντίγραφον, 7₁₁ ὑποκείμενον. In the different rendering of Ezr. 4₁₁ in Esdr. A' 2₁₂ ὑπογεγραμμένην probably reflects the same interpretation.

³⁴ The admissibility of this interpretation (independent of the rabbinic etymology) is considered in Batten's commentary, pp. 135 and 356.

³⁵ Cf. P. Kahle, *Theol. Stud. und Krit.*, 88, 1915, 412 ff. — About targum and Septuagint cf. the following section.

II. JEWISH ANTECEDENTS

"The (set) scriptural passage from the Hebrew Book of Exodus has been read and the words of the mystery have been made clear." The listeners have heard the indistinct sounds of the sacred original and an elucidation of their literal meaning: *πῶς τὸ πρόβατον κτλ.* The moment has come (*τοῖνυν*) for the Christian rhetor to convey the allegorical signification of the *ῥήματα τοῦ μυστηρίου*.

But for the novelty of the material implications this plain interpretation would surely have occurred to any reader of this sentence. I therefore proceed to advance some arguments suggesting that this novel fact, an Old Testament lesson read in Hebrew to a Christian audience, fits a general historical context.

The reading of passages from the sacred books, followed by an address, is one of the unquestioned cases of the adoption, by the church, of synagogal practice.³⁶ *Katub*, or *miqra*, became *γραφὴ* or *ἀνάγνωσμα*; the *midrash*, or *derasha*, homily. And, characteristically enough, just as the Christian rhetor replaced the Jewish rabbi on his *bēma*, so the official *ἀναγνώστης*, once the assistant of rhetors and grammarians,³⁷ replaced the volunteering layman in reading 'Moses and the prophets' — a Hellenization of Jewish institutions. Melito enables us, at one point, to define and specify this process.

In the Palestinian synagogue the lessons were read in Hebrew, the sacred language no longer spoken by the community. One may compare the use of Latin by the present Roman Catholic Church. To-day a bilingual service-book enables the faithful to follow the service. In the ancient synagogue the 'interpreter' (meturgeman) inserted a rendering in the vernacular Aramaic after every verse of the torah.³⁸ It was enjoined that he must

³⁶ See (e.g.) W. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, 1913, 367; H. Lietzmann, *Geschichte der alten Kirche*, I, 1932, 153; C. Höeg, *La notation ecphonétique*, 1935, 150 f.

³⁷ Cf. W. Susemihl, *Literaturgeschichte der Alexandrinerzeit*, I, 685; C. Höeg l.c., 152.

³⁸ The Talmudic passages referring to the meturgeman have been often quoted; most completely by Strack-Billerbeck, III, 1926, 465 ff. The persistence, among the Palestinian Jews, of the alternate reading of single verses in Hebrew and Aramaic appears to be indicated by the fact that the Genizah fragments of the Pentateuch targum are written in the same way (see P. Kahle, *Masoreten des Westens*, II, 1930, p. 2).

not read it out from a book, lest a second Sacred Scripture might seem to exist. Yet of necessity such translations were early put down in writing, to serve the meturgeman in preparing for his task, and the believer in studying the scriptures.³⁹ Thus the targum came into being. Its preserved, more recent varieties in many ways witness to the existence of earlier forms.⁴⁰ The same practical necessities as in Palestine and Babylonia made themselves felt wherever Jews maintained their ancestral forms of worship. The old targum used in Upper Mesopotamia was adapted and taken over by the church of Edessa: it is the basis of the Old Testament Peshittah.⁴¹ The targum used by the Greek-speaking diaspora is the Septuagint.⁴² Here an important step was taken: the translation itself acquired scriptural dignity. Justin, Tertullian and others attest its use in the synagogue service;⁴³ and it cannot have been used, as originally the Aramaic targums, only for interpreting the single verses of the original. For the hieratic cantillation characteristic of Hebrew scripture recitation was handed on, from the Hellenistic synagogue, to the Latin and to the Byzantine church: the service-books of the latter still indicate its modes by the 'ecphonetic neums.' The details of this historical process have not previously been clear.

The opinion to-day prevails that, in the Hellenistic synagogues, the Hebrew original was entirely ousted by the readings from the LXX. This I find difficult to believe; and in fact this opinion is based only on general considerations whose conclusiveness is open to question. The main argument is com-

³⁹ G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, I, 1927, 174.

⁴⁰ Cf. L. Zunz, *Die Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden*, 1832, 75 ff.; P. Kahle, *Masoreten des Westens*, II, 1930, *passim*.

⁴¹ Cf. P. Kahle, *l.c.*, p. 3 f.; A. Baumstark, *Biblische Zeitschrift*, 1931, 257 ff.

⁴² The analogy between Targum and Septuagint has often and in various connections been remarked upon (for older literature see H. Hodijs, *De Bibliorum text. orig.*, 1705, 240 ff.; more recently see E. Schürer, *Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes*, III⁴, 140, n. 17 and H. Lietzmann, *l.c.*, I, 84). P. Kahle (*Theol. Stud. und Krit.*, 88, 1915, 410 ff.) has shown new ways of approach. — In Melito the introduction of the angel, instead of Jahwe himself, slaying the Egyptians (cf. Num. 20¹⁶) is a haggadic feature of the kind typical both of targum and Septuagint; it is presupposed, and rejected, in the old midrash published by L. Finkelstein, *H.T.R.*, XXXI, 1938, 296; cf. *ib.*, 307, note 32, and H. Lietzmann, *l.c.*, 85 f. on Greek Halacha and Haggada.

⁴³ Cf. E. Schürer, *l.c.*, 141, note 22.

monly sought in the ignorance of Hebrew among the 'Hellenists.' This however would equally apply to the Palestinian Jews who, nonetheless, went on listening to the Hebrew lessons. Reference to present day usage in the Roman and Coptic churches also goes far to invalidate this inference.⁴⁴ Those torah rolls in their sacred chests depicted, as symbols of traditions faithfully kept, on so many Jewish inscriptions: ⁴⁵ can they be supposed altogether to have contained, not the original, but translations? It seems against the *character indelebilis* of Jewish traditionalism.

R. Simon — whose opinions no one would lightly dismiss — supposed both the original and the translation to have been read in the service of the Hellenists — as, in fact, it was done in Justinian's age (Nov. 146).⁴⁶ For those earlier times, this remains an hypothesis; yet one, so it seems to me, rather more probable than the alternative one. If it is accepted, the adoption by the church of the traditional Jewish way of reciting the lessons is explained in every detail: the Jews transferred their mode of cantillation to the Septuagint read immediately after the original: the early Christians carried it with them, from the synagogue into the church, together with the whole practice of reading the Old Testament. When introducing, later on, les-

⁴⁴ It is perhaps not even necessary to suppose that the lector must always have been expert in Hebrew: he might memorize his text from a transcript. So do Coptic priests to-day.

⁴⁵ Cf. J. B. Frey, *Corpus Inscriptionum Judaicarum*, I, 1936, index, p. 663 f. s.v. Rouleau sacré, Etui, Aron and ib., CXLII f.; cf. the decorations of the aedícula in the Dura synagogue, where the repository of the torah is still discernible (Excavations at Dura, VI, 1936, 320, 343, 351, 371 ff.); for the portrait of one reciting the torah (Ezra?) next to the aedícula see ib., pl. XLVIII and Rostovtzeff, *Dura-Europos and its Art*, 1938, p. 100 ff., pl. XX and XXI.

⁴⁶ R. Simon, *Hist. Crit. du V. T.*, 1685, 293: "Il y a même lieu de douter, qu'on n'ait autrefois lû dans les Synagogues des Juifs Hellénistes, que la seule Version des Septante, comme on le croit communément. Il y a au contraire bien plus d'apparence que parmi les Juifs Hellénistes . . . on ne lisoit cette Traduction Grecque, que comme une explication ou paraphrase; de la même manière que dans les Synagogues des Juifs de Babylone, de Jerusalem et des autres endroits où la Langue Caldaïque était en usage, il y avoit un Interprète qui paraphrasoit le texte Hébreu en Caldéen. . . . Il est donc fort vraisemblable qu'on a lû la Loi en Hébreu dans les Synagogues des Juifs qu'on appelle Hellénistes aussi bien que dans les autres Synagogues" etc., with reference to Justinian Nov. 146; cf. ib., 181 ff. and 502. R. Simon repeated his assertion, with greater assurance, in *Hist. Crit. du N. T.*, 1689, 316 and 324.

sons from their own scriptures also they applied the same manner of recital to them.

Even without reference to Melito some hypothesis of this kind is called for to explain the phenomenon of Byzantine *lectio solemn**is*. Now, the same hypothesis is indicated by the particular practice referred to in Melito's first sentence: if, in the synagogues of the diaspora, readings from the original text were followed, and made clear, by the corresponding passages from the LXX, then the church addressed by him was just keeping up an observance of the Hellenist synagogue. No other testimony is extant in direct support of this assumption — if there were any, this sentence would not have caused such bewilderment. Yet the interpretation suggested seems to afford a pretty safe basis, the pedigree of the word *διασαφένω* in particular pointing to an identical usage in Church and Synagogue. Moreover, there are suggestive analogies in Christian ecclesiastical practice.

III. CHRISTIAN ANALOGIES

Early Eastern Christianity knew of church officials analogous to those of the synagogue. The *ὑπηρέτης* is charged with the manifold duties of the Jewish hazzan;⁴⁷ the meturgeman has his counterpart in the *ἐρμηνεύς*.⁴⁸ In a small synagogue the hazzan might have to satisfy both needs.⁴⁹ It happens to be the same also in the oldest extant testimony for the Christian *ἐρμηνεύς*. It is from the opening chapter of the second, fuller, edition of Eusebius' book on the Palestinian martyrs.⁵⁰ St.

⁴⁷ Epiphanius, *Panarion*, 30¹¹, 'Ἀγανιτῶν τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς διακόνων ἐρμηνευομένων ἢ ὑπηρετῶν' (quoted by J. B. Frey, l.c., XCIX, with literature).

⁴⁸ The greater part of the material here presented has been brought together already by the great scholars of the 17th and 18th centuries; see (e.g.) H. Hodus, *De Bibliorum textibus originalibus*, 1705, 334; cf. Th. Zahn, *Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons*, I, 1888, 43 and E. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes*, II⁴, 1907, 85 and 534.

⁴⁹ Megillah 4¹; I. Elbogen, *Der jüdische Gottesdienst*, 1913, 187.

⁵⁰ An excerpt in the original Greek of the passage in question is preserved in the Byzantine Synaxarion; see Th. Zahn, *Tatians Diatessaron*, 1881, 19 and P. Violet, *T. U.*, XIV, 1896, 110. It is unfortunate that since the days of Valesius it is quoted time and again from the Latin *Acta Martyrum* — as if the Eusebian source had not been traced.

Procopius, so we are told there, served the church of Scythopolis in various capacities: as exorcist, lector and interpreter; beside reading the lessons he gave τὴν ἐρμηνείαν τῆς τῶν Σύρων φωνῆς: an instance, from Palestine, of official διασάφησις of lessons in the third century.⁵¹

The Euchologion compiled by Serapion of Thmuis, the friend of Athanasius, gives the earliest Egyptian instance. The hierarchy of ecclesiastical dignitaries, from the bishop downward, is described in the 25th prayer.⁵² After the hypodiakonos figure ἀναγνώσται and ἐρμηνεῖς. The persistence of bilingual service in Egypt is attested by numerous fragments of lectionaries with the Coptic and Greek texts in parallel columns. Later on Arabic, too, comes into the picture.

In Palestine the Church continued to provide for the needs of a polyglot body of believers.⁵³ The Aquitanian pilgrim Silvia-Aetheria relates: ⁵⁴ *lectiones etiam quaecumque in ecclesia leguntur quia necesse est graece legi, semper stat qui siriste* (in Syriac) *interpretatur*; others translate them also into Latin. The Bethlehemite sermons of Jerome testify to the same usage.⁵⁵ It persisted into the Middle Ages: Brightman ⁵⁶ published an intercession, from a MS. of ca. 1166 A.D., ὑπὲρ πρεσβυτέρων, διακόνων, διακονισῶν, ὑποδιακόνων, ἀναγνωστῶν, ἐρμηνευτῶν, ἐπορκιστῶν.

Epiphanius, in enumerating the ecclesiastical orders,⁵⁷ may well be referring to Palestinian usage. After lectors and deaconesses he mentions ἐπορκισταὶ καὶ ἐρμηνευταὶ (ἀπὸ) γλώσσης εἰς γλώσσαν ἢ ἐν ταῖς ἀναγνώσεσιν ἢ ἐν ταῖς προσομιλίαις.⁵⁸

⁵¹ Cf. the "presbyter" of II Clem. reading and expounding the lesson from Isaiah 54.

⁵² L. Wobbermin, T. U., XVII, 3, 1899, 18; Brightman, J. T. S., 1900, 103, cf. ib., 93; F. X. Funk, Didasc. et Constit., II, 1905, 169.

⁵³ Cf. E. Schüier, l.c., 85; Clark, The Acts of the Apostles, 1933, p. LIX ff.; Byzantion, XIV, 1939, 568 f.

⁵⁴ Itin. Hieros., ed. Geyer, 1898, p. 99.

⁵⁵ G. Morin, Anecd. Mareds., II, 220 ff.

⁵⁶ Liturgies Eastern and Western, I, 1896, 501²⁶, 502³¹; cf. ib., 578.

⁵⁷ De Fide 21 (Panarion, p. 52²² Holl).

⁵⁸ According to Const. Apost. II 4⁴ the bishop is expected to be πολλὸς ἐν ταῖς ἀναγνώμασιν, ἢ αὐτὸς γραφὰς ἐπιμελῶς ἐρμηνεύῃ (cf. ib. 7 πάντα ἐπιμελῶς κατὰ λέξιν ἐρμηνεύσης). Here, as in the old Apostolic Church-order 16, this injunction apparently refers to exegesis proper (as e.g. Eusebius Vita Const., 4, 54² ἄλλοι δὲ ἐρμηνείας τῶν θείων ἀναγνωσμάτων ἐποιούντο, τὰς ἀπορρήτους ἀποκαλύπτοντες θεωρίας). The parallel passage in the Syriac Didaskalia is rendered "vertat et interpretetur" by Funk, and "interpret

All these testimonies refer to polyglot communities. They can show that where the need for *διασάφης* arose the Church was ready to meet it, and also that the original language of sacred texts was maintained in services where it tended to be incomprehensible to the audience. In these cases, however, this sacred language was Greek.⁵⁹ In the oldest Church the interpreters of glossolaly had satisfied a similar need. The usage attested — if our interpretation is accepted — by Melito would then appear to have been no isolated phenomenon. On the contrary, the general facts of lectionary practice, as outlined above, give semblance to the hypothesis that at some early date it may have been widespread. This assumption can be supported by general considerations: the far-reaching dependence on Jewish models of early Christian cults, rites, and prayers;⁶⁰ the conception of Christianity as the true Israel; the ensuing adoption of the Old Testament; the Semitic affinities of a great proportion of the believers. Yet the silence of Justin and Tertullian, Clement and Origen is strong evidence that they did not know of this practice. It may, nevertheless, have existed before their time, and at other places. For, it must be borne in mind that not one even of the most definite instances of the adoption by the Church of Jewish rites is expressly attested as such, and that particularly with regard to early lectionary practice the extant positive evidence is lamentably scarce.⁶¹

This scarcity of direct corroborating evidence makes one look out for special points of contact between Melito and Jewish, or Jewish-Christian traditions. They would be helpful in appreciating the survival, in Melito's circle, of an ancient usage

and expound" by Conolly. Is it just redundancy of expression? or is a reference to bilingual service to be acknowledged?

⁵⁹ I hope shortly to produce a theory of the "Western Text" of the New Testament based in part on the facts mentioned in this section.

⁶⁰ Cf. H. Lietzmann, *Geschichte der alten Kirche*, I, 204 ff., especially 209.

⁶¹ Cf. H. Lietzmann l.c., I, 150, II, 122. — With diffidence I would here mention one possible argument: Hippolytus in his paschal sermon (the affinities of which with Melito's were recognized by Professors Ch. Martin and C. Bonner) reads out the LXX version of the whole Exodus passage on which he is going to comment. An exegetic homily not preceded by a lesson is unbelievable; so why this duplication? Had the lesson been in Hebrew?

fast falling into desuetude; still more they would be needed to support the student who — different from the present writer — might incline towards regarding this usage as the outcome of a curious local idiosyncrasy. In fact, such special points of contact are not lacking.

IV. MELITO

In Asia Minor the Jewish element was strong, particularly since the great settlements effected by Antiochus III.⁶² Antisemitism was consequently virulent (Ignatius, Polycarp, Melito); nevertheless a powerful Jewish element is discernible in Asianic Christianity both heretic and orthodox. Granted that this distinction is, for this time, rather arbitrary, the Naassene sect and the 'Judaisers' opposed by Ignatius may be quoted for the former, and the circles of 'John' and of the 'presbyters' for the latter.⁶³ The connection with Jerusalem was kept up. Many Palestinian Christians settled in Asia: it is enough to refer to John in Patmos, Papias, Justus Barsabbas and Philippus in Hierapolis; Papias interviews the followers of the apostles; the Apocalypse is the most Jewish of New Testament books; the Quartodecimans — Melito among them — stuck to the Jewish Passah-date.

In this environment a Hebrew lesson preceding a Christian sermon seems more natural than in almost any other in the Christian world. Moreover, Melito is known to have visited Palestine.⁶⁴ The Old Testament canon which he ascertained there, and on which he based his *Ἑκλογία*, testifies to his interest in Hebrew traditions; it comprises only the books recognized by the rabbis, and excludes those adopted from the LXX by the Christians in general.⁶⁵ And finally, the occasion was the most

⁶² Cf. W. M. Ramsay, *The Letters to the Seven Churches*, ch. XII.

⁶³ The references, in Irenaeus and his sources, to the ancient Christian presbyters as *κρῆστοις ἡμῶν* are in Jewish style (*Iren. haer.*, I, praef. 2; I, 13³; III, 17⁴ etc.; cf. Philo, *Migr. Abr.*, 89).

⁶⁴ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, IV, 26.

⁶⁵ Cf. (e.g.) Th. Zahn, *Geschichte des Kanons*, I, 1888, 117; C. Thomas, *Melito*, 1893, 107 f.; H. B. Swete, *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, 1900, 221. But for the exclusion of Esther, Melito's canon is identical with the Jewish in Epiphanius, *Panarion* 8, 6 and the Nasorean *ib.*, 29, 7⁴. — I have refrained from using the fourth

definitely Jewish feast of the calendar;⁶⁶ the bishop of Sardis then may have thought an exhibition of traditionalism fitting.

But must it have been in Sardis? An alternative is suggested by Melito's Palestinian journey. The persistently polyglot character of Christian (and Jewish) worship in Palestine has been noted above. The hypothesis that Melito's speech was delivered there would seem to afford the plainest possible solution of the problems raised by its first sentence.⁶⁷ Synagogues in Palestine are certain to have kept up the reading of lessons in Hebrew; the church of James the Just and its successors would naturally follow their lead. Epiphanius indeed tells of the Nasoraei *παρ' αὐτοῖς πᾶς ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται* . . . *Ἑβραϊκῶς ἀναγινώσκεται, ὥσπερ ἀμέλει καὶ παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις*.⁶⁸ It is an easy assumption that other branches of the early Palestinian church did the same. Palestinian Jews were accustomed to the meturgeman explaining the lesson by the Aramaic targum. Are we then, in considering the Palestinian alternative, to suppose the *διασάφησις* also of the lesson preceding Melito's speech to have been in Aramaic?

There is much to recommend this assumption. The analogy between Jewish and Christian usage would thus be perfect; the paraphrase of the lesson on page 2 of the homily would no longer appear as a duplication of this targum; the extant Syriac version of parts of Melito's speech might possibly be brought into relation with the interpreter's rendering immediately following its delivery: the Jewish meturgeman translated the midrash, too, and similarly the Christian *ἐρμηνεύς* was concerned, not only with the lesson, but also with the homilies.⁶⁹

Against this assumption, the resulting combination of three

Catena-fragment (Pitra Spic. Sol., II, LXIII; reprinted (e.g.) in E. Goodspeed, *Die ältesten Apologeten*, 1914, 313) in evidence of Melito's Jewish affinities. The style of its relevant second part is that of Caesarean and Antiochian textual criticism; *ὁ Ἑβραῖος* and *ὁ Σύρος* are typical Hexaplaric terms (Field, LXXV ff.); already Combefis showed that the same scholion is preserved under the name of Eusebius of Emesa (Montfaucon, *Hexapla ad Genes.*, 22¹⁸). Piper then (*Theol. Stud. und Krit.*, I, 1838, 65 ff., quoted by Harnack *T. U.*, I, 254) was right in assigning it to this fourth century author; C. Thomas (l.c., 38 f. and 213) did not grasp the conclusiveness of his argument.

⁶⁶ Cf. Lietzmann l.c., I, 129.

⁶⁷ This possibility was first mentioned to me by P. Maas.

⁶⁸ Epiphanius Haer., 29, 7⁴ (p. 329, 14 ff. Holl).

⁶⁹ See Epiphanius (quoted above p. 311).

languages in one service would not perhaps be a decisive argument: a comparable 'polyglossy' is attested for a later date by 'Silvia' and Jerome.⁷⁰ This argument, however, appears to be incontrovertible: the audience assembled to enjoy the exhibition of the ecclesiastical rhetor must have known Greek: for them an Aramaic *διασάφησης* would have been useless. Consequently, also if the hypothesis of Melito's sermon having been delivered in Palestine is preferred, the 'elucidation' of the lesson preceding it is likely to have been, like the homily itself, in Greek.⁷¹ The great Hellenist element among the Jewry even of Palestine would render the assumption of a direct Jewish precedent permissible for this practice also. It is enough to mention, in this context, the name of Aquila.⁷²

To sum up:

(1) Linguistically Melito's first sentence would be naturally understood to refer to a Hebrew scripture-lesson followed by a (Greek) targum (LXX).

(2) Historically, this statement at an important point confirms and illustrates the dependence of Christian liturgical practice upon, and its adaptation from, Jewish models.

(3) The practice to which Melito is supposed to refer may be regarded as the survival of a usage which had been widespread at some early date. This assumption can be based upon general considerations and in particular on the later history of lectionary practice; but it is not supported by direct and unequivocal evidence.

(4) Owing to the strong Judaist element in Asianic Christianity, this usage may be assumed to have persisted in Sardis. Yet, on the basis of present day knowledge, the data are most conveniently related to Palestinian customs. Melito may therefore be thought to have delivered his homily in Palestine rather than in Sardis.

⁷⁰ See above p. 311.

⁷¹ The Syriac eclogues from Melito's oration are more likely, with the bulk of Syriac translations of Greek theological literature, to have originated in Upper Mesopotamia at some later date than to have been adapted from some old Palestinian rendering (the manuscript is dated 562 A.D.). And Melito's paraphrase (unlike Hippolytus' repetition) of the lesson can be regarded as reinforcing rather than duplicating the *διασάφησης*.

⁷² On "Hellenists" in Palestine see R. Simon, l.c. (above, note 46), p. 294, and the same in his *Castigationes*, 1685, p. 22, against Isaac Vossius (who had asserted that a Greek paraphrase was read also in Jerusalem): "Longe verius dixisset, his locis ubi lingua Syriaca apud Judaeos erat vernacula, accessisse lectioni Hebraicae sacri contextus interpretationem Syriacam; in iis vero locis ubi apud Judaeos vigeat sermo Graecus, accessisse Graecam interpretationem. Sic etiam Hierosolymis in Synagoga Alexandrinorum, qui Graece loquebantur, non dubito quin sacer contextus primo Hebraice pro antiquo synagogarum usu lectus fuerit, deinde Graece . . . agnosco cum Vossio etiam in Judaea linguam Graecam" (for this we have more evidence to-day from archaeology, inscriptions, the study of Greek words in the Talmud, etc.).

A SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE ON THE OPENING OF MELITO'S HOMILY

CAMPBELL BONNER

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

DR. ZUNTZ's learned and acute paper must be taken into account by all future students of Melito's homily. He has carried the discussion of the opening sentence into a field where I am not competent to follow him, and I must therefore refrain from any estimate of his principal conclusions. Of the following points, some are intended to clarify my own position, others suggest additional questions which should be considered in any final summing up.

1. Dr. Zuntz has done well to insist upon a closer examination of the words ἡ γραφή τῆς Ἑβραϊκῆς ἐξόδου, to which the introduction and note in the edition did not, as it appears, do full justice. He is doubtless right in rendering *γραφή* by "scriptural passage" rather than the vaguer "scripture."

2. Under his heading "B," I think he misunderstands my position. When he refers to "the accepted interpretation" I suppose he must mean that offered in my edition, since there has not been time or opportunity, under the present circumstances, for any considerable number of scholars to reach even a tentative agreement about the sentence. But by "the accepted interpretation" he seems to understand that τῆς ἐξόδου was taken to mean "the departure of the Israelites." That was not my intention. The translation given on page 168 of the edition reads "the Scripture of the Hebrew Exodus." Note the capital, which shows that the book of Exodus is meant; it might have been better to print the Greek word with a capital also. There remains the question of the adjective Ἑβραϊκῆς. As my note on the passage indicated, the word is not confined to contexts dealing with letters or language. Philo said Ἑβραϊκὴ στρατιά (Vit. Mos. 1. 285) and Melito may have said πόλις Ἑβραϊκή in § 94, to judge by the version of Syr.² Could not

